



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2004

No. 6

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONNER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 27, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JO BONNER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

THE U.S. MUST DO MORE TO FIGHT CHILD HUNGER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 102 Members of Congress sent a bipartisan letter to President Bush asking him to restore the original funding level for the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education Program when he submits his fiscal year 2005 budget next week.

The McGovern-Dole program began as a \$300 million pilot program in 2001. It provided at least one nutritious meal each day to nearly 7 million children in 38 countries. The catch? These children

had to attend school in order to get the meals.

Providing food to malnourished children in schools is one of the most effective strategies to fight hunger and poverty. Where programs are offered, enrollment and attendance rates increase significantly, particularly for girls. Instead of working or searching for food to combat hunger, children have the chance to go to school. Providing food at school is a simple but effective means to improve literacy and help poor children break out of poverty.

The McGovern-Dole program helps us to achieve many of our foreign policy goals and communicates America's compassion to those around the world. And at the end of the day, it will be programs like McGovern-Dole that will ultimately triumph over poverty and terror.

One year ago, in February 2003, the U.S. Department of Agriculture evaluated this program, and the conclusions were overwhelmingly positive. In addition to significantly reducing the incidence of hunger among school-age children, the program was also found to promote educational opportunity, especially for girls, among some of the poorest populations in the world.

Sadly, in fiscal year 2003, McGovern-Dole received only \$100 million in funding, reducing the number of children served to scarcely more than 2 million worldwide in just 28 countries. In fiscal year 2004, President Bush only asked for \$50 million, and acting under severe budget constraints, this is what Congress provided. In brief, for fiscal year 2004, the United States will literally be taking food out of the mouths of yet another 1 million hungry children and forcing many of their families to remove them from school.

The senior Senator from Kansas and the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, PAT ROBERTS, has stated on a number of occasions his belief that the McGovern-Dole program

serves our national security interests by attacking the breeding grounds of terrorism, hunger, poverty, ignorance, and despair, while at the same time ensuring that children are fed in settings where they receive a quality education rather than hate-filled indoctrination. But rather than expanding this program to reach even more school-age children, to help stabilize communities devastated by HIV/AIDS, and to support HIV/AIDS orphans so that they might contribute to the future of their nations rather than burden them, we cut this program once again.

On November 26, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization released its 2003 report on hunger. It found that after falling steadily during the 1990s, hunger is again on the rise. In the developing world, the number of malnourished people grew by an average of 4.5 million a year for the past 3 years. The report also found that hunger exacerbates the AIDS crisis, drives rural people into the cities, and forces women and children to trade sex for food and money.

Yet over the past 3 years, we have cut funding for the McGovern-Dole school feeding program so that it is now one-sixth of what it once was. This means that 84 out of every 100 children we were feeding and schooling under this program in 2001 have been cut off from this food source. They now either go to school hungry or have once again dropped out of school.

Mr. Speaker, this is a disgrace, plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker, we are going in the wrong direction, not just for the children of the world, but for the security of our Nation. If as a nation we are committed to defeating terrorism, then we must increase and fully fund programs like McGovern-Dole, along with other food aid and development programs.

If as a nation we are committed to addressing hunger, poverty, illiteracy,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H101

and ignorance, then we must increase and restore full funding to the McGovern-Dole program and our other food aid and development programs.

And if we, as a nation, are committed to helping educate the children of the world, especially girls, then we must increase and restore full funding to the McGovern-Dole program.

Mr. Speaker, I call on President Bush and the congressional leadership to restore full funding in fiscal year 2005 to the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education Program. It is truly a matter of life or death.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2003.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge you to provide \$300 million in your Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Proposal for the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. We believe it is urgent to restore funding for this program at levels similar to those of the original pilot program.

We strongly believe this funding is critical for sustaining and expanding the McGovern-Dole Program in order to combat terrorism and to help build and consolidate democracy in the Middle East, southern Asia, the Near East, and in other regions critical to U.S. national security. As you are aware, the McGovern-Dole Program provides donations of U.S. agricultural products, as well as financial and technical assistance, for school feeding and maternal and child nutrition programs in low-income countries. We note that recommendations made by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in February 2002 on how to strengthen and improve the administration and implementation of school feeding programs were fully integrated into the law establishing the McGovern-Dole Program, enhancements that we believe contribute to its success.

Both the initial pilot program and the current McGovern-Dole Program have a proven track record at reducing the incidence of hunger among school-age children and improving literacy and primary education, especially among girls, in areas devastated by war, hunger, poverty, HIV/AIDS, and the mistreatment or marginalization of women and girls. School meals, teacher training, and related support have helped boost school enrollment and academic performance. McGovern-Dole nutrition and school feeding programs also improve the health and learning capacity of children both before they enter school and during the years of primary and elementary school.

In February 2003, the U.S. Department of Agriculture evaluated the McGovern-Dole pilot program and found significant positive results. Specifically—

“The results to date show measurable improvements in school enrollment, including increased access by girls. In projects involving more than 4,000 participating schools, the WFP reports an overall enrollment increase exceeding 10 percent, with an 11.7 percent increase in enrollment by girls. The PVO's report an overall enrollment increase of 5.75 percent in GFE-participating schools. In some projects, increases in enrollment were as high as 32 percent compared with enrollment rates over the previous three years.” (USDA, The global Food for Education Pilot Program: A Review of Project Implementation and Impact, page 2, February 2003)

We firmly believe that these programs reduce the risk of terrorism by helping to eliminate the hopelessness and despair that breed terrorism. American products and commodities are directly associated with hunger alleviation and educational opportunity, encouraging support and good will for the United States in these communities and countries.

We strongly urge that you restore the capacity of this critically important program by providing \$300 million for Fiscal Year 2005.

Sincerely,

James P. McGovern, Frank Wolf, Jo Ann Emerson, Marcy Kaptur, Doug Bereuter, Tom Lantos, Earl Pomeroy, Amo Houghton, Barbara Lee, Sam Graves, Edolphus Towns, Don Manzullo, Vic Snyder, Jim Leach, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Smith (NJ), Marty Meehan, Doc Hastings (WA), Dennis Moore, George Nethercutt, John Olver, Jerry Moran (KS), Bennie G. Thompson (MS), Todd Tiahrt, Adam Schiff, David Price, Maurice Hinchey, James Oberstar, Betty McCollum, William Delahunt, Bob Filner, Jan Schakowsky, Sheila Jackson Lee, Leonard Boswell, Gary Ackerman, George Miller, Dale Kildee, Julia Carson (IN), Albert Wynn, Carolyn Maloney, Bobby Rush, Diana Christensen, Raul M. Grijalva, Bob Etheridge, Pete Stark, Jim McDermott, Jim Matheson, Jerry Costello, Mike Capuano, Joseph Crowley, Susan Davis (CA), Rosa DeLauro, Martin Frost, Rick Larsen (WA), Sander Levin,

Ed Markey, John Tierney, Lynn Woolsey, Donald Payne, Hilda Solis, Mike McNulty, Elijah Cummings, Mike Doyle, Joseph Hoeffel, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bernie Sanders, Sam Farr, Neil Abercrombie, Jim Marshall, Charles Gonzalez, Ruben Hinojosa, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Earl Blumenauer, Robert Wexler, Rob Andrews, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Jose Serrano,

Maxine Waters, Lane Evans, Barney Frank, Ron Kind, Sanford Bishop, Jr., Sherrod Brown (OH), Henry Waxman, Steve Rothman, Nancy Pelosi, Dennis Kucinich, Tom Allen, Jim Moran (VA), Rick Boucher, Brad Sherman, Carolyn Kilpatrick, Lois Capps, Karen McCarthy, Patrick Kennedy (RI), Jane Harman, Alcee Hastings (FL), William Jefferson, Chris Van Hollen, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lynch, Charles Rangel.

IMMIGRATION REFORM NEEDED IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, good afternoon. With our Nation's dedication to homeland security after the horrors of September 11, most citizens believe today that it is time to strengthen, secure our borders and reform our immigration policies.

It appears that some type of reforms are on the horizon. And reforms are needed. Many of us on this floor believe that above all else, we should enforce our immigration laws that are currently on the books. It is the men and women who stand on our borders today, enforcing these laws every day, but they may be confused. Unsure of their relevance, border agents are now questioning why they must fight each day to secure our borders in light of the proposed “guest worker” program.

This program was to help Mexico's President Fox as part of a large amnesty plan that has been in the works since September 11 after the terrorist attacks. But, Mr. Speaker, a question could be asked, why are we rewarding a country that has been opposed to our war on terror?

According to the Subcommittee on Social Security of the House Committee on Ways and Means, benefits paid to retirees will exceed revenues in just 15 years. The pay-as-you-go system could have serious financial problems in the year 2030. These projections do not take into account the economic impact of the “guest worker” proposal, which would allow untold millions of illegal aliens from Mexico to collect benefits for themselves and their families from their home country without having to work the required number of years that law-abiding citizens must work to be eligible for these same payouts.

The deal may cost overburdened U.S. taxpayers over the next 20 years also. Supporters of this “guest worker” program call this program, “totalization.” I am not sure what they mean. But, this proposed agreement could be thought of as a transfer of wealth from those who play by the rules the American way to those who willingly and knowingly mock our own immigration and tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for Mr. Fox, the President of Mexico, to look to his own country for reform instead of his continuing to lobby to change U.S. policy. Vital reforms in Mexico will break down the barriers to economic growth and provide more and better opportunities for the people of Mexico. Similar reform in other regional countries will reduce the incentives to make the difficult trek into our country. The President's plan, although convenient, merely, I believe, postpones our reckoning with a situation in which over 8 million people are here illegally.

I certainly hope that the administration will take a hard look at this “guest worker” program that is being proposed and perhaps look for real immigration reform first, and that, Mr. Speaker, could start with reform in the state of Mexico.

NEW CBO DEFICIT NUMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office once again confirmed that President Bush is the most fiscally irresponsible President in our Nation's history. Yesterday CBO forecast a budget deficit for the 2004 fiscal year of \$477 billion, the largest deficit in history. Furthermore, CBO said the overall Federal deficit will total nearly \$2.4

trillion over the next decade. That is nearly \$1 trillion worse than what CBO forecast last fall.

After the estimates were released, Treasury Secretary John Snow commented from London that the administration remains committed to deficit reduction, stating, "Make no mistake; President Bush is serious about the deficit."

Mr. Speaker, who is Secretary Snow trying to fool? President Bush being serious about the deficit? This is the same President Bush who inherited a \$5.6 trillion surplus from President Clinton. Over the past 3 years, thanks mainly to three large tax breaks primarily benefiting America's millionaires, President Bush has presided over an \$8.5 trillion fiscal collapse.

And our Nation's fiscal situation could get even worse this year if Congress continues to listen to President Bush and the House Republican leadership. That is because CBO's estimates only take into account existing policies.

And just last week, during the State of the Union address, President Bush asked Congress to make all his fiscally irresponsible tax policies permanent. Last year CBO estimated that such action would cost the Federal Government an additional \$1 trillion.

The President also once again proposed partially privatizing Social Security at an additional expense of at least \$1 trillion in extra funds over the next decade, and that is \$2 trillion right there to add to the already gloomy deficit forecast. And this is not even including the \$700 billion the President wants to spend for a mission to Mars, the \$50 billion that the President will propose for the continuing war in Iraq, and the \$1.5 billion throwaway to the far right in his party to help train couples to develop better interpersonal skills that sustain "healthy marriages."

Based on these facts, how can Secretary Snow say that President Bush is serious about the deficit?

Let us be clear. It is the policies of President Bush and my Republican colleagues that have put us in this situation. Democrats do not control the White House. Democrats do not control the Congress, either the House or the Senate. And yet I would not be shocked if conservative Republicans do not come to the floor today and try to blame Democrats for the fiscal mess our Nation now faces.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, President Bush now sees the huge budget deficit as a threat to his reelection campaign, and that is why he vowed to cut the deficit in half over the next 5 years during his State of the Union address last week. But we might be asking ourselves how the President plans to cut the deficit in half with the more than \$2 trillion in tax cuts and other new spending he wants Congress to approve this year. The President and Republicans will say holding down domestic spending to 1 percent during the next year will put a

huge dent in the deficit, but that is simply not the case, considering that domestic spending only amounts to 17 percent of all the Federal spending expected this year.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker: The fiscal record of the Bush administration and congressional Republicans is clear. As long as Republicans control the Federal budget, our Nation's fiscal future is seriously in question; and in order to prevent a total fiscal collapse, it is time for President Bush and my Republican colleagues to face reality and repeal the President's tax cuts for the very wealthiest Americans.

It is time President Bush and congressional Republicans stand with our Nation's children, who will be forced to bear the brunt of the cost of their fiscal irresponsibility. It is time the President and congressional Republicans stand with our Nation's seniors and baby boomers that need Social Security and Medicare strengthened and not raided.

Yesterday's CBO report should serve as a wake-up call to Washington Republicans. And let us hope they finally listen to the alarms before this mess gets even worse.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, shepherd Your people as never before, for the times are turbulent. Violence and terrorism rip apart the very fabric of civilization, ancient and new. Friendships between nations are threatened. And who will replace the basic trust and faithful love once found in family life?

As in the days of the prophet Zechariah, we call out to You to show forth Your power.

Take up Your two staves, one called Favor, the other Union.

With the staff of Favor, fashion us again as Your people. Renew Your covenant love within Your chosen ones.

With the staff of Union, bind all in this House to one another as leaders, worthy and willing to be brother and sister to others.

May You delight in us as Your very own and our coming together as a glimpse of Your kingdom, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SPECIAL-ED STUDENT VOTED HOMECOMING KING

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, most homecoming kings are probably athletes or student government leaders, the "in crowd"; but students at a Tempe, Arizona, high school broke the mold. Marcos de Niza High School's landslide winner for homecoming king was a 21-year-old student with Down Syndrome, Poco Carton.

Poco is well-known around campus for his dance moves at lunch and for his insistence on saying hello to nearly everyone. The election is a vivid reminder that each and every life, regardless of what value the world places on it, is worthy of living. Every day, Poco and those who share his challenges offer priceless contributions to our communities, but too often they are taken for granted, excluded from the opportunities many of us take for granted.

Studies show that 86 percent of unborn children who are diagnosed with Down Syndrome are never given a chance to be elected homecoming king. They are aborted. Down Syndrome is a challenge that taxes anyone facing it. Families caring for children with this disease need our support and encouragement, but if we believe that the way to kill Down Syndrome is to kill babies, we are dead wrong.

How many Poco Cartons have we lost to this strategy? How many lives could have been touched at schools like Marcos de Niza? It is a cost too high to calculate.

HONORING THE REVEREND CHARLIE MURRAY

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday I had the opportunity to participate in a tremendous ceremony, the naming of a dining hall at the

church that I attend on a regular basis. We named it the Charlie H. Murray, the Reverend Charlie Murray, who is the pastor emeritus of this church; and as we thought of the contributions that this gentleman had made, we had brought practically every Senator, every mayor, Presidential candidates, all to this small church because of the tremendous outreach and appeal of the Reverend Charlie Murray.

So as we go into primary elections and people are voting and thinking about electing a new President, we thought that was an appropriate time to pay tribute to a church man who had been civically involved.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER BRIAN D. HAZELGROVE

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is written that we are to grieve with those who grieve and mourn with those who mourn. It is in that spirit today that I rise to honor a hero, Chief Warrant Officer Brian Hazelgrove.

Warrant Officer Hazelgrove is the son of Ron and Patty Hazelgrove of Edinburg, Indiana, a small town just a stone's throw from my home, where I am sure today in Sherman's Barber-shop and elsewhere there is genuine grief and sadness at the loss of this 1994 graduate of Edinburg High School.

Warrant Officer Hazelgrove joined the Army in that year of 1994. He began his service in military intelligence before becoming a pilot and serving two tours of duty in South Korea.

He was serving with the 3rd Squadron, 17th Air Cavalry Regiment from the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum, New York. He died this January 23, 2004, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom when his OH-58D Kiowa Warrior helicopter went down 31 miles south of Mosul, Iraq. He was bravely executing a combat mission at the time.

Warrant Officer Hazelgrove, Mr. Speaker, died like every other American soldier throughout our Nation's history, bringing hope and freedom to a people who have never known it before.

On behalf of the people of the sixth congressional district, I extend my deepest sympathies and prayers to the family of Chief Warrant Officer Hazelgrove, to his lovely wife, Kimmi; their four children, Taylor, 11; Zachary, 10; Brandon, 3; and Katelyn, 7 months. Indiana and America mourn the loss of this heroic American, Chief Warrant Officer Brian Hazelgrove.

WHAT PRESIDENT BUSH DID NOT TELL US ABOUT THE MEDICARE BILL

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week President Bush stood in this

well and told us that he signed a Medicare bill last month. What he did not tell us was that this bill does not take effect until 2006. What he did not tell us is that this bill gives the insurance companies a \$14 billion taxpayer subsidy. What he did not tell us is that this bill provides \$139 billion more to the drug companies in profits, and what he did not tell us was how little coverage this Medicare prescription drug bill will give to most of America's seniors.

This bill falls short because the Medicare bill was written by the drug industry and by the insurance industry, for the drug industry and for the insurance industry in the Oval Office.

COLLABORATION ON THE AFTERMATH OF IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is important at this time to restate a position that many of us took in this Nation in opposition to the attack against Iraq: preemptive, unilateral, and without a constitutional vote of this Congress.

We have long since said that we stand united behind the United States military, but it is clear that our policies now in the aftermath are failing, with the insurgents going against our troops in high numbers, with the loss of life increasing and now the political delay because those in Iraq want direct and prompt election. In addition, it is important not to cover up the wash out, the white out, the words of Mr. Kay, finding no weapons of mass destruction.

Today, I ask for a serious and collaborative effort with the United Nations who, of course, this government has approached, our NATO allies and Mideast allies to deal with the aftermath of Iraq.

Secondarily, I ask for a full and open hearing by all committees of jurisdiction on the issue of the lack of finding of weapons of mass destruction. I do that because that is the basis upon which representations were made to the United States and the people for which we entered into Iraq. It is imperative that these hearings are open and free for the public to hear, for the national security, to ensure the security of our homeland and the security of our troops and the security of all those around the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

BREAST CANCER STAMP EXTENSION

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1385) to extend the provision of title 39, United States Code, under which the United States Postal Service is authorized to issue a special postage stamp to benefit breast cancer research, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1385

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BREAST CANCER STAMP EXTENSION.

Section 414(h) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking "2005" and inserting "2006".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1385, introduced by my distinguished colleague from my home State of California (Mr. BACA), extends the life of the breast cancer research semipostal stamp.

Mr. Speaker, on the night of July 22, 1997, Dr. Ernie Bodai, Betsy Mullen, and David Goodman sat breathlessly in the House gallery awaiting the outcome of a vote that they had worked tirelessly to see become a reality. At that time, H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, was landmark legislation establishing the Breast Cancer Research Stamp Program and directing the U.S. Postal Service to issue a new first-class breast cancer stamp with proceeds benefiting breast cancer research at the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Programs.

This advocacy team, a surgeon, a survivor and a widower, used their own time and resources to convince lawmakers to pass this essential legislation.

Dr. Ernie Bodai of Carmichael, California, a constituent and personal friend of mine, led the charge. After 14 visits to Washington within 2 years, as well as spending over \$100,000 of his personal savings, he succeeded, creating the lead for breast cancer fundraising. Dr. Bodai is the pioneer of the breast cancer stamp, chief of general surgery for Kaiser Permanente, and CEO of CureBreastCancer, Inc.

Joining him in this crusade was Betsy Mullen. Ms. Mullen is one of slightly over 2 million women living in the United States who have been diagnosed with and treated for breast cancer. She was diagnosed with breast cancer in 1992 at age 33 and formed the Women's Information Network Against Breast Cancer, the acronym WIN ABC, which provides information and support for life-and-death decisions about treatment options.

The final member of this advocacy team is David Goodman, a WIN board member who lost his wife to breast cancer less than a year before appearing on the House floor.

H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, passed the House on a 433 to three vote; and on August 13, 1997, President Clinton signed this legislation into law. By May 9, 1998, the U.S. Postal Service unveiled the new 40 cent stamp, and August 9 the stamp officially went on sale to the public.

The legislation we are considering today, H.R. 1385, reauthorizes the breast cancer research stamp program through the year 2006. The stamp marks the first time that some of the proceeds of stamp sales have gone to fund research, and the awareness raised as a result of this historic stamp designed to save lives continues to be priceless. As of December of 2002, 421.3 million breast cancer research stamps have been sold dating from July 29, 1998, raising almost \$30 million for biomedical breast cancer research at the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program receives 30 percent of the moneys raised from stamp sales. Since the breast cancer stamp was introduced, Department of Defense has received over \$9 million from the stamp's sales, and the National Cancer Institute has received \$24 million.

The breast cancer stamp functions like a regular first-class stamp and is purchased on a voluntary basis by the public. In 1997, when a person purchased the breast cancer stamp, 32 cents would be used for postage and the extra 8 cents from each stamp sold was turned over to research programs run by the National Institutes of Health and the Defense Department. Today, the stamp can be purchased for 45 cents.

The stamp is a line drawing of the Roman goddess Diana reaching back to retrieve an arrow from her quiver, and the words, "Fund the fight. Find a cure," written across.

□ 1415

The exact cause of breast cancer is not known; therefore it is imperative that researchers continue to study the basic biology of cancer.

Research proposals funded by the Breast Cancer Research Stamp look at the basic biology of breast cancer, such as understanding the changes in breast cells, including DNA and proteins in

the cells that result in the development of breast cancer. An increased understanding in cancer cells could lead to the development of new drugs to prevent or treat breast cancer.

Funding is directed to prevention, detection, diagnosis and treatment research projects. Studies examine the use of antibiotics to block breast cancer cell growth, to observe tumor behavior to keep the cancer from spreading, to explore immunotherapy and the potential to create a vaccine to stimulate the human immune system to protect itself from breast cancer, and search for alternatives to mammography for breast cancer detection.

The program's success encouraged Congress to appropriate additional funds to the Breast Cancer Research Program in subsequent years, totaling over \$1.6 billion through fiscal year 2004. To date, the Breast Cancer Research Program supported awards in three categories: Research, Research Resources, and Training Recruitment, as well as the Innovator Award.

Projects are coordinated to specifically avoid duplication of research between the Department of Defense on the one hand and the National Institutes of Health on the other. Awards are meant to fill gaps in ongoing research and to complement initiatives sponsored by other agencies. The Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program has emphasized support for research and training awards that encourage innovative approaches to breast cancer research to accomplish the program's vision of eradicating breast cancer.

In addition to research, the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program has sponsored three Era of Hope meetings to publicly present results of DOD funded studies and provide researchers with the opportunity to share their results with the scientific community, with policymakers, and with the lay public. The most recent meeting, in 2003, was held in Orlando, Florida, with over 1,500 scientists, clinicians, and breast cancer survivors and advocates in attendance.

A National Cancer Institute report estimates that about one in eight women in the United States will develop breast cancer during her lifetime. It is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in women, accounting for 30 percent of all cancers in women. In 2004, more than 40,000 individuals are projected to die from breast cancer. In 2003, the American Cancer Society estimated 21,100 new cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed among women in my home State of California and, of these, 4,000 women will die from this disease.

An individual's breast cancer risk depends on a variety of factors, including family history, reproductive history, life-style factors such as heavy alcohol consumption and smoking, and a number of other factors that are not yet understood. A woman's risk for developing breast cancer increases if her mother, her sister, her daughter, or

two or more other close relatives, such as cousins, have a history of breast cancer, especially at a young age. However, 85 percent of women who develop breast cancer have no known family history of the disease.

Early detection and treatment is the key to survival. Declining death rates caused by breast cancer are believed to be the result of early detection and improved treatment. Breast cancer prevention experts strongly encourage women of all ages to have regular mammograms and to conduct breast self-examinations monthly.

When people choose to purchase the Breast Cancer Stamp every day, they can turn that simple little act into a meaningful and effective way to participate in the fight against breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by thanking my friend, Dr. Ernie Bodai, for his persistence in this fight against breast cancer. Driving through Sacramento, he can be easily spotted in his car, which is adorned by its license plate PL 105-41, the public law number that made the breast cancer fund-raising stamp official. It is in honor of this man and to honor the lives of the victims of breast cancer that I stand before my colleagues, supporting the reauthorization of H.R. 1385.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for his efforts towards stamping out breast cancer, and I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 1385.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform's Special Panel on Postal Reform and Oversight, I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) in consideration of H.R. 1385 extending the issuance of the Breast Cancer Semipostal Stamp through December 31, 2006. H.R. 1385, as amended, was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) on March 20, 2003, and has 145 cosponsors.

Semipostals are stamps sold with a surcharge above the cost of a first-class postage stamp with the net surcharge amount going to a designated cause. We owe our interest in semipostal stamps to Dr. Ernie Bodai, Chief of Surgery at the Kaiser Permanente Medical Center in Sacramento, California, and former Representative Vic Fazio. Dr. Bodai first proposed the idea of a semipostal with the money raised going towards breast cancer research. He took his idea to Representative Fazio, and on May 7, 1996, Representative Fazio introduced the first semipostal bill, H.R. 3401, the Breast Cancer Research Stamp Act. Representative Fazio was joined in this effort by Senator Dianne Feinstein of California when she introduced identical legislation in the Senate.

The following year, Representative Fazio joined Representative Susan Molinari of New York in introducing H.R. 1585, Stamp Out Breast Cancer. This bill was subsequently enacted into law, Public Law 105-41. The law not only authorized a breast cancer research stamp for 2 years, it also required the General Accounting Office to submit a report to Congress that evaluated the effectiveness of the appropriateness of this method of fund-raising. In its first report issued in 2000, GAO determined that the semipostal statute was successful and an effective and appropriate way to fund-raise.

By way of addressing the health issues raised by many of the semipostal bills pending in Congress, the chairman and ranking members of the former Subcommittee on the Postal Service, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) introduced H.R. 4437, the Semipostal Authorization Act. This measure, which became law, Public Law 106-253, provided the Postal Service with discretionary authority to issue semipostals provided the revenue raised goes to Federal agencies and is for medical research. Such authority is similar to the discretion the Postal Service currently has in deciding which commemorative stamps to issue.

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women in our country. More than 2 million women have been diagnosed with breast cancer and at least another 1 million are unaware that they have it. Every year, nearly \$7 billion is spent on breast cancer treatment, all the more reason to support the issuance of a Breast Cancer Semipostal Stamp.

Since its issuance in 1998, the Breast Cancer Stamp has raised over \$30 million for research. By law, the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense are the recipients of the money and are required to submit an annual report to Congress on the amount of funds received, how the funds were spent, and accomplishments. The sale of the Breast Cancer Research Stamp has done much to increase public awareness of the disease and has allowed millions of people the opportunity to participate directly in raising money for this much-needed research.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for his effort and cannot express enough my support for his measure. I would also like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and the House leadership, both Democrat and Republican, and the Senate for working to ensure an additional source of research money for breast cancer.

I urge the swift adoption of H.R. 1385.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), who introduced this important resolution.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for his support.

I rise in support of H.R. 1385, my bill to authorize the Breast Cancer Research Stamp through the year 2006. I am proud to say that the language in my original bill extending the stamp through the year 2005 was included in the omnibus and signed by the President last Friday. This amendment will extend the stamp for 1 additional year, through the year 2006.

It has been a long, hard fight to extend the Breast Cancer Research Stamp. It is a fight I began when I was in the California assembly and have continued to do so here in Congress.

But we would not be here today without the hard work of several individuals. I want to thank Dr. Bodai for first asking me to introduce this resolution urging Congress to extend its research stamp when I was in the California State Assembly. It was Dr. Bodai who developed the idea of a Breast Cancer Research Stamp, and it was through his crusade and persistence that we have it here today. Had it not been for him doing it in California, in Sacramento, it would not have happened.

I also want to thank Senator FEINSTEIN and the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE). And I know it was difficult for him to be here this afternoon, because he and I were both on the Red-eye. He knew the importance of this bill and what it means to many individuals, and I want to thank him for his leadership and his hard work and what he has done to make sure that the sunset on the research stamp is extended. And for that, I compliment the gentleman for taking the time, on the Red-eye, on this important issue to address this issue here today.

I introduced this bill last year for one reason, and that is to save lives. All of us care about saving lives. This issue is more important to me now. I recently learned from my son, Joe Baca, Jr., that his wife's grandmother passed away from breast cancer. We will miss Josefine Sanchez and many others who have died, but early detection and prevention and research may have prevented this. By working together to pass this important piece of legislation we can prevent such tragedies.

This year, more than 200,000 women and men will be diagnosed with breast cancer. More than 40,000 women and men will die from this disease. Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in every major ethnic group in the United States. And I say every ethnic group, not one, but all. It does not discriminate. Whether an individual is white, black, Hispanic, or whatever race or

ethnicity, everyone is at risk. Early prevention and early detection is of the utmost importance.

Breast cancer is still the number one cancer killer of women between the ages of 15 to 54, between 15 to 54. The disease claims a woman's life every 15 minutes in the United States. Imagine that, claiming the life of a woman every 15 minutes. More than 2 million women are living with breast cancer in America today, yet 1 million of them have not been diagnosed. One million women have not been diagnosed. That is why it is important to increase the funding for breast cancer research.

The Breast Cancer Research Stamp is among the most successful commemorative stamps of all time, with 485 million stamps sold. I repeat: 485 million stamps sold. The stamp program has generated over \$35 million for breast cancer research. It has been a critical ally in generating the resources necessary to wage war on this terrible, terrible disease.

□ 1430

The stamp is a semipostal stamp that can be voluntarily purchased by the public for only 45 cents. It is worth it to save a life. Eight cents of each stamp sold goes to the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program.

Working with Dr. Bodhai, Senator FEINSTEIN introduced the Breast Cancer Research Stamp bill in 1998 to help support the fight against breast cancer. I am also proud to say that California continues to lead the way, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) for starting it in Sacramento, along with Dr. Bodhai. It has contributed over \$3 million in research funds, or roughly 21 percent of the money raised nationwide.

Today, I ask for Members' support for the Breast Cancer Research Stamp, my bill, and all women and men who will benefit from the money the stamp raises.

We have the support of 150 Members who have cosponsored my bill, and countless organizations like the American Cancer Society, American Medical Association, the Breast Cancer Fund, and the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation.

By supporting reauthorization of this stamp, you are not only helping research but you are helping to raise awareness and save future lives.

Think about it: the customer purchases a stamp, a carrier delivers it, and a person receives it. That is three people who have seen the message saying breast cancer needs to be stamped out. Each time we use the stamp, not only do we raise additional funds for research; we send a message of hope to many men and women who have this terrible disease. We need to find a cure, and we will find a cure. With Members' continued support of this legislation, we will do that.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for being here for what I believe is an enormously important commitment to saving lives.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for the commitment he has shown, as stated in the gentleman's opening statement, and for offering this legislation, to do something that is more than honorable, that is, to save lives. My hat is off to the gentleman, and I stand here as a very proud cosponsor of this legislation for what it means to those who are fighting every day against this devastating disease.

Needless to say, there is not one of us, 435 in this body and certainly 100 Senators, who has not been confronted by family members and by those who are experiencing the devastation of breast cancer. Certainly there are many of us who have lost loved ones. Breast cancer is a devastating disease, and it has been stood up to by the women of America. This particular semipostal legislation, which allows for research dollars to come, is imperative that it be continued. And the reason is midway, otherwise, in the middle of very serious research, we would wind up having to stop that research because of the fact that resources are no longer there.

I certainly want to acknowledge Ethel Kesler, who helped design this stamp, and Whitney Sherman as well; and I want to make it very clear that we appreciate the senior Senator from California's initial leadership. Let me make note of the fact that cancer makes an impact on every single ethnic group in America.

Mr. Speaker, 2 million are living with breast cancer in America today, but yet 1 million have not been diagnosed. Breast cancer incidence in women has increased from one in 20 in 1960 to one in 8. Breast cancer is still the number one cancer killer of women between the ages of 15 and 54. The disease claims another woman's life every 15 minutes.

I want to emphasize there are major local community groups working on this issue. I have worked with Sisters Network in Houston, Texas. They are an outreach group that goes to inner city residences to encourage women to be tested for breast cancer. One of the worse parts of this disease is it is a silent killer. If women do not get a mammogram, and I remember some fights years ago, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) remembers this as well, where there were no benefits to allow poor women to go forward and have mammograms. There was a debate whether it be covered or not. I appreciate the Women's Caucus and this

body fighting very hard to involve and make everyone conscious of the fact that all women should be able to have access to mammograms.

Sisters Network in Houston, Texas, and they have chapters around the country, is a minority-based, African American-based organization that particularly reaches out to our community for those who may be intimidated by the medical system or are not covered by health insurance. I remember going door to door with packets of information, reaching out to both Hispanic and African American women to encourage them to seek mammograms.

This is an important legislative initiative; and although it may be on a very cold and stormy day in Washington, D.C., there is a glimmer of sunlight that this legislation be reauthorized so researchers on the front line of saving lives will have an opportunity to do so.

As I close, let me thank all of the survivors who are living with cancer or who have survived breast cancer. I thank them for their steadfastness and courage. They are a shining example to others, ensuring others might live. Again, I add my appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) for their enthusiastic support, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today in support of the Breast Cancer Research Stamp. The Breast Cancer Research Stamp was first introduced in 1998 by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN to help support the fight against breast cancer.

It is among the most successful commemorative stamps of all time with 485 million stamps sold. The stamp program has generated in excess of \$35 million for breast cancer research.

The idea for the stamp was developed in California by Sacramento oncologist, Dr. Ernie Bodai. The stamp was designed by Ethel Kessler of Bethesda, MD, and illustrated by Whitney Sherman of Baltimore, MD. The stamp is a "semi-postal" stamp that can be voluntarily purchased by the public for 45 cents with 8 cents benefiting the National Institute for Health and the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program. If the sunset on the stamp had not been extended, many important research projects would have gone unfunded, hurting the fight against breast cancer. The stamp was set to expire on December 31, 2003.

This initiative is so important because of the devastating effects of Breast Cancer. Breast cancer is considered the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in every major ethnic group in the United States. More than 2 million women are living with breast cancer in America today, yet one million of them have not been diagnosed. Breast cancer incidence in women has increased from one in 20 in 1960 to one in eight today. Breast cancer is still the number one cancer killer of women between the ages of 15 and 54. The disease claims another woman's life every 15 minutes in the United States.

This year, more than 200,000 women and men will be diagnosed with breast cancer and more than 40,000 women and men will die from breast cancer. It is tragic that one woman in eight either has or will develop breast cancer in her lifetime. In addition, 1,600 men will be diagnosed with breast cancer and 400 will die this year.

In my state of Texas alone, in 2002, there were 12,819 new cases of breast cancer and an estimated 800 deaths. In Texas, African Americans are more likely to develop cancer and more likely to die from the disease.

At this time there are slightly over 2 million women living in the U.S. who have been diagnosed with and treated for breast cancer. Every 3 minutes a woman in the United States is diagnosed with breast cancer.

As introduced, H.R. 1385 reauthorized the Breast Cancer Research Stamp for two years, through 2005. The language from H.R. 1385 was included in the Omnibus by Senator FEINSTEIN and became law on January 23, 2004. As amended, H.R. 1385 will extend the reauthorization for one additional year, through 2006.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation and urge my colleagues to realize the significance of this bill and what we can do to fight this battle together.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) for this legislation. It is an important piece of legislation, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of it.

This is the first fund-raising stamp in the United States, and it benefits the eradication of breast cancer. During the holidays at home wherever I was, whether it was a holiday party, in the grocery store, wherever I was, there was someone that came up to me and said I went to the post office to buy the breast cancer stamp, and was told that it is no longer available because Congress has not reauthorized it. People know, and they have become attached to this effort and very supportive of it for what it produces.

The stamp was introduced in 1998, and the profits are split between the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense's Health Research Division, as called for by Congress. Over 450 million of these 45 cent stamps have been sold. I am very proud to say that of the \$35 million raised, California continues to lead the way because we have contributed roughly 21 percent of the money that has been raised nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have expressed our collective concerns about the issue of breast cancer. Certainly during my tenure in the Congress I have been very proud to have worked on the causes of breast cancer, for the optimal treatments for breast cancer, and ultimately a cure for breast cancer. These have all been priorities of mine.

I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is here on

the floor. We worked very hard together to pass the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, which was introduced and passed in the 106th Congress. As one of my colleagues said, more than 2 million women in America are living with breast cancer today. During the time that we have been on the floor and making comments on this, three women in the United States have died as a result of breast cancer. The statistics we still carry with us. I think this is an important effort, and I thank everyone who is a part of this effort and urge all of my colleagues to vote for this measure and make it unanimous so we send a message out to Americans who have gone to their post office and not found this stamp available that Congress has reauthorized it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that California is leading the way on this issue, and the rest of us are very pleased to follow their example. I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, according to the National Cancer Institute, 1 in 8 women will get breast cancer in her lifetime. I rise today in support of H.R. 1385, the Breast Cancer Research Postal Stamp because I believe that number is unacceptable.

Breast cancer is currently the most common cancer among women in the United States with incidents on the rise. In my home State of New Jersey over 6,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer last year and tragically, approximately 1,500 women died from this terrible disease. I support and cosponsored H.R. 1385 because it is about changing those statistics, it is about hope.

In December of 2003, the Breast Cancer Research Stamp expired, and today we have an opportunity and a responsibility to renew it. Approximately 500 million copies of this special Breast Cancer Research Stamp have been sold, raising about \$40 million for the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program. These are programs that help more women get screened, help more breast cancer cases to be detected and detected early, and help more women get the treatment that allows them to survive.

There is another very positive aspect of the Breast Cancer Research Stamp—it raises awareness. Each time the stamp passes hands as a letter goes from sender to recipient, another person becomes aware; another man grows concerned and reminds his wife to get a mammogram, another woman schedules a check-up with her doctor, and another mother teaches her daughter about breast self exams.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because "breast cancer needs to be stamped out!" I strongly hope that my colleagues will stand with me and reauthorize the Breast Cancer Research Stamp.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of reauthorizing the Breast Research Stamp Act (H.R. 1385). The public has widely supported the stamp, and their voluntary purchases have generated over \$35 million dollars for breast cancer research. The National Institutes of Health and the Depart-

ment of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program use this donation to help the 2 million women nationwide who are daily battling this disease.

The Breast Cancer Research Stamp was developed by Dr. Ernie Bodai, designed by Ethel Kessler, and introduced by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN in 1998. Since its introduction, over 485 million stamps have been sold with 8 cents of each purchase price going toward breast research. The stamp expired December 31, 2003 and there has been overwhelming support to extend the stamp's production through 2006. Congressman JOE BACA proposed the stamp's extension with 148 cosponsors and numerous groups including the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association supporting H.R. 1385.

The revenue created by the sale of this stamp will help fight the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women, and it will be used to educate women and encourage early detection practices in Texas and across the country. The Alamo Breast Cancer Foundation (ABCF) is a San Antonio based organization that supports awareness, treatment, and counsels those receiving cancer treatments. In Texas alone, 13,700 women will be diagnosed and 2,600 lives will be lost to this disease in the coming year. In the entire country, 40,000 people a year will die from breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, breast cancer will touch 1 out of every 8 women in America. This statistic is far too high and includes mothers, grandmothers, college students, and their loved ones. I urge my fellow Representatives to support the Breast Research Stamp Act and to continue to present the public with a simple method to donate to a worthy cause.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1385, the reauthorization of the Breast Cancer Awareness Stamp.

As a co-sponsor of H.R. 1835, I believe this bill is critical to continue to fund research for a disease that affects 2 million women in the United States alone. The Breast Cancer Research stamp was introduced in July 1998 and has raised \$35 million in five years for the Department of Defense and the National Cancer Institute for research in treating breast cancer. Of those funds raised, \$279,000 has gone to the University of Arkansas for research.

Breast Cancer is the leading cancer afflicting American women, and this year nearly 40,110 women will die of breast cancer, and over 215,000 new cases will be diagnosed. Unfortunately, many of these cases will not be diagnosed, and deaths will occur, in communities where access to advanced medicine is limited.

Congress's commitment to increasing the funding for cancer prevention and early detection is helping us battle this disease. Today we can be proud of the advancements we have made. But we must continue our commitment to defeating breast cancer by continuing to fund the research necessary to fight breast cancer.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1385 to extend the provision of title 39, United States Code, under which the United States Postal Service is authorized to issue a special postage stamp to benefit breast cancer research. I want to thank Mr. BACA for his support in introducing this legislation.

The Breast Cancer Research stamp has been a successful tool to raise funds to sup-

port research and programs to aid in the fight against breast cancer. Despite the extra cost added to purchase the first class stamps and three postage rate increases since its debut in 1998, the Breast Cancer Research stamp has brought in over \$35 million for innovative research, prevention and treatment programs and other initiatives at the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense.

There are hundreds of thousands of women fighting breast cancer and over 200,000 new cases that will be diagnosed this year. The funds raised by the Breast Cancer Research stamp provide hope to the victims and their families. More importantly, it symbolizes our commitment to eliminating this devastating disease.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1385. Let us continue this successful program in the hopes that one day there will be success in finding a cure.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1385, legislation which would allow the United States Postal Service to continue its successful breast cancer semipostal stamp. Proceeds from this stamp directly benefit breast cancer research.

Breast cancer is a serious concern for all of us. We all have friends, family members, constituents and colleagues who have battled this serious disease. Breast cancer does not discriminate—Americans of every age, race, religion, gender, economic standing and political affiliation are affected by this disease.

The figures are alarming. An estimated three million women in the U.S. are living with breast cancer—one-third of whom do not know they have this deadly disease. It is the most common form of cancer in America, excluding skin cancers. More than 240,000 new cases—1 every 3 minutes—occur in the United States each year. More than 40,000 women will die from the disease.

One of our strongest weapons against breast cancer is early awareness and treatment. Women who are screened and diagnosed early can begin treatment before the disease becomes more advanced. That is why raising awareness of the disease is so critical.

The breast cancer stamp has clearly helped to raise awareness and funds for this serious disease. Since it was first created in 1998, more than 421 million stamps sold, raising \$29.5 million for biomedical breast cancer research. The alarming rate at which breast cancer is detected mandates that we continue to work toward a cure for this disease which is claiming so many lives worldwide. Enactment of H.R. 1385 will further enable research in an effort to increase the survival rate.

This disease calls for each of us to take a stand in an effort to find a cure and bring some solace to a disease that has tormented our mothers, wives, aunts, sisters and daughters. The importance of this stamp has immeasurable value and I strongly support enactment of this important legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to join the 145 cosponsors of this bill by passing H.R. 1385.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in complimenting the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for introducing this legislation, and I urge all Members to support its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1385, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MEDICAL DEVICES TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3493) to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to make technical corrections relating to the amendments made by the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3493

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Medical Devices Technical Corrections Act".

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS REGARDING PUBLIC LAW 107-250.

(a) TITLE I; FEES RELATING TO MEDICAL DEVICES.—Part 3 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379i et seq.), as added by section 102 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1589), is amended—

(1) in section 737—

(A) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking "and for which clinical data are generally necessary to provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness" and inserting "and for which substantial clinical data are necessary to provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness";

(B) in paragraph (4)(D), by striking "manufacturing";

(C) in paragraph (5)(J), by striking "a premarket application" and all that follows and inserting "a premarket application or premarket report under section 515 or a premarket application under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act."; and

(D) in paragraph (8), by striking "The term 'affiliate' means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity" and inserting "The term 'affiliate' means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity (whether domestic or international)"; and

(2) in section 738—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking "subsection (d)," and inserting "subsections (d) and (e).";

(II) in clause (iv), by striking "clause (i)," and all that follows and inserting "clause (i)."; and

(III) in clause (vii), by striking "clause (i).," and all that follows and inserting

"clause (i), subject to any adjustment under subsection (e)(2)(C)(ii)."; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), in each of clauses (i) and (ii), by striking "application" and inserting "application, report.";

(B) in subsection (d)(2)(B), beginning in the second sentence, by striking "firms, which show" and inserting "firms, which show";

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking "Where" and inserting "For fiscal year 2004 and each subsequent fiscal year, where"; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B), beginning in the second sentence, by striking "firms, which show" and inserting "firms, which show"; and

(II) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking "Where" and inserting "For fiscal year 2004 and each subsequent fiscal year, where";

(D) in subsection (f), by striking "for filing"; and

(E) in subsection (h)(2)(B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively;

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively;

(iii) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) MORE THAN 5 PERCENT.—To the extent such costs are more than 5 percent below the specified level in subparagraph (A)(ii), fees may not be collected under this section for that fiscal year."

(b) TITLE II; AMENDMENTS REGARDING REGULATION OF MEDICAL DEVICES.—

(1) INSPECTIONS BY ACCREDITED PERSONS.—Section 704(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 374(g)), as added by section 201 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1602), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by striking "conducting inspections" and all that follows and inserting "conducting inspections of establishments that manufacture, prepare, propagate, compound, or process class II or class III devices, which inspections are required under section 510(h) or are inspections of such establishments required to register under section 510(i).";

(B) in paragraph (5)(B), in the first sentence, by inserting after "standards of accreditation," the following: "or where the Secretary has information indicating that the relationship between the establishment and the accredited person may create a conflict of interest.";

(C) in paragraph (6)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking "of the establishment pursuant to subsection (h) or (i) of section 510" and inserting "described in paragraph (1)";

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(aa) by striking "each inspection" and inserting "inspections"; and

(bb) by inserting "during a 2-year period" after "person"; and

(II) in subclause (I), by striking "such a person" and inserting "an accredited person";

(iii) in clause (iii)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "and the following additional conditions are met:" and inserting "and 1 or both of the following additional conditions are met:";

(II) in subclause (I), by striking "identified under subclause (II) of this clause" and inserting "identified under clause (ii)(II) as a person authorized to conduct inspections of device establishments"; and

(III) in subclause (II), by inserting "or by a person accredited under paragraph (2)" after "by the Secretary";

(iv) in clause (iv)(I)—

(I) in the first sentence—

(aa) by striking "the two immediately preceding inspections of the establishment" and inserting "inspections of the establishment during the previous 4 years"; and

(bb) by inserting "section" after "pursuant to";

(II) in the third sentence—

(aa) by striking "the petition states a commercial reason for the waiver"; and

(bb) by inserting "not" after "the Secretary has not determined that the public health would"; and

(III) in the fourth sentence, by striking "granted until" and inserting "granted or deemed to be granted until";

(v) in clause (iv)(II)—

(I) by inserting "of a device establishment required to register" after "to be conducted"; and

(II) by inserting "section" after "pursuant to"; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following clause:

"(v) The eligibility of the establishment for inspections by accredited persons has not been suspended under subparagraph (B)(iv)(II).";

(D) in paragraph (6)(B)(iii)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ", and data otherwise describing whether the establishment has consistently been in compliance with sections 501 and 502";

(ii) in the second sentence—

(I) by striking "inspections" and inserting "inspectional findings"; and

(II) by inserting "relevant" after "together with all other"; and

(iii)(I) by inserting "(I)" after "(iii)";

(II) by adding at the end the following subclause:

"(II) In making a decision under this paragraph, the Secretary may consider any information relevant to the establishment's compliance with any provision of this Act. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed to expand the Secretary's inspectional authority under subsection (a).";

(E) in paragraph (6)(B)(iv)—

(i) by inserting "(I)" after "(iv)"; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following subclause:

"(II) If, during the two-year period following clearance under subparagraph (A) with respect to a device establishment, the Secretary obtains information indicating significant deviations from compliance with this Act or implementing regulations, the Secretary may, after notice and an opportunity for a written response, notify the establishment that the eligibility of the establishment for inspections by accredited person has been suspended.";

(F) in paragraph (6)(C)(ii), by striking "in accordance with section 510(h), or has not during such period been inspected pursuant to section 510(i), as applicable";

(G) in paragraph (10)(B)(iii), by striking "a reporting" and inserting "a report"; and

(H) in paragraph (12)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) the number of inspections conducted by accredited persons pursuant to this subsection and the number of inspections conducted by Federal employees pursuant to section 510(h) and of device establishments required to register under section 510(i)."; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking "obtained by the Secretary" and all that follows and inserting "obtained by the Secretary pursuant to inspections conducted by Federal employees";

(2) OTHER CORRECTIONS.—

(A) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 301(gg) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331(gg)), as amended by section 201(d) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1609), is amended to read as follows:

“(gg) The knowing failure to comply with paragraph (7)(E) of section 704(g); the knowing inclusion by a person accredited under paragraph (2) of such section of false information in an inspection report under paragraph (7)(A) of such section; or the knowing failure of such a person to include material facts in such a report.”.

(B) ELECTRONIC LABELING.—Section 502(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352(f)), as amended by section 206 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1613), is amended, in the last sentence—

(i) by inserting “or by a health care professional and required labeling for in vitro diagnostic devices intended for use by health care professionals or in blood establishments” after “in health care facilities”;

(ii) by inserting a comma after “means”;

(iii) by striking “requirements of law and, that” and inserting “requirements of law, and that”;

(iv) by striking “the manufacturer affords health care facilities the opportunity” and inserting “the manufacturer affords such users the opportunity”; and

(v) by striking “the health care facility”.

(C) TITLE III; ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 301(b) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1616), is amended by striking “18 months” and inserting “36 months”.

(2) PREMARKET NOTIFICATION.—Section 510(o) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360(o)), as added by section 302(b) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1616), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “, adulterated” and inserting “or adulterated”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, adulterated” and inserting “or adulterated”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “semicritical” and inserting “semi-critical”.

(D) MISCELLANEOUS CORRECTIONS.—

(1) CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 515.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 515(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360e(c)), as amended by sections 209 and 302(c)(2)(A) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1613, 1618), is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) (as added by section 209 of such Public Law) as paragraph (4).

(ii) MODULAR REVIEW.—Section 515(c)(4)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360e(c)(4)(B)) is amended by striking “unless an issue of safety” and inserting “unless a significant issue of safety”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 210 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1614) is amended by striking “, as amended” and all that follows through “by adding” and inserting “is amended in paragraph (3), as redesignated by section 302(c)(2)(A) of this Act, by adding”.

(2) CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 738.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 738(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j(a)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning on” and inserting the following:

“(a) TYPES OF FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on”; and

(II) by striking “this section as follows:” and inserting “this section.”; and

(ii) by striking “(1) PREMARKET APPLICATION,” and inserting the following: “(2) PREMARKET APPLICATION.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 738 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

(21 U.S.C. 379j), as amended by subparagraph (A), is amended—

(i) in subsection (d)(1), in the last sentence, by striking “subsection (a)(1)(A)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)(A)”;

(ii) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “subsection (a)(1)(A)(vii)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)(A)(vii)”;

(iii) in subsection (e)(2)(C)—

(I) in each of clauses (i) and (ii), by striking “subsection (a)(1)(A)(vii)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)(A)(vii)”;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “subsection (a)(1)(A)(i)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)(A)(i)”;

(iv) in subsection (j), by striking “subsection (a)(1)(D),” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)(D).”.

(C) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102(b)(1) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1600) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 738(a)(1)(A)(ii)” and inserting “section 738(a)(2)(A)(ii)”.

(3) PUBLIC LAW 107-250.—Public Law 107-250 is amended—

(A) in section 102(a) (116 Stat. 1589), by striking “(21 U.S.C. 379f et seq.)” and inserting “(21 U.S.C. 379f et seq.)”;

(B) in section 102(b) (116 Stat. 1600)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);

(ii) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(iii) by striking:

“(b) FEE EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ENTITIES SUBMITTING PREMARKET REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person submitting a premarket report” and inserting:

“(b) FEE EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ENTITIES SUBMITTING PREMARKET REPORTS.—A person submitting a premarket report”; and

(C) in section 212(b)(2) (116 Stat. 1614), by striking “, such as phase IV trials.”.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON BARRIERS TO AVAILABILITY OF DEVICES INTENDED FOR CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the barriers to the availability of devices intended for the treatment or diagnosis of diseases and conditions that affect children. The report shall include any recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services for changes to existing statutory authority, regulations, or agency policy or practice to encourage the invention and development of such devices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3493.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3493 is a bill that I introduced with the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. ESHOO), which seeks to make technical and clarifying amendments to the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002 (MDUFMA). That bill, which was signed into law by President Bush on October 26, 2002, made sweeping changes to the laws that govern medical device approvals to establish new programs and streamline processes to accelerate the availability of medical devices to patients. For example, MDUFMA established a user fee program that will provide substantial new resources to speed up the approval of the medical devices. It streamlined the approval of combination products such as drug-coated stents which are one of the most exciting new areas of technology. It expanded the role of third parties and outside experts to augment the FDA resources to help FDA meet its beneficial manufacturing inspection requirements; and MDUFMA also extended the use of third-party review programs for 1 year so that it expires in conjunction with other device provisions.

The legislation before us today amends the Medical Device User Fee Modernization Act to ensure that it is being implemented properly. While some of the amendments are truly technical, others clarify the intentions of Congress. For example, this legislation ensures that the user fee reductions that apply to small businesses apply for 2004 and years in the future. In addition, the legislation clarifies that as part of the third-party inspection program, companies must submit reports of inspectional findings consistent with current FDA practices.

□ 1445

H.R. 3493 clarifies which data need to be submitted for a firm to be eligible for third-party inspection.

Medical devices are some of our health care system's most remarkable innovations. The provisions in this technical and clarifying amendments bill will allow the FDA to continue to reduce review times, increase the efficiency of its operations and allow these wonderful technologies to be delivered to patients more quickly.

I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and each of their staffs for this legislation. This has been another outstanding example of teamwork and bipartisanship on the part of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to support this legislation which is intended to, and will,

help ensure that FDA's medical device user fee and third-party review programs operate as intended. The goal of these programs is to promote timely access to medical devices without compromising FDA's ability to properly evaluate both the safety and the effectiveness of those devices. Successful bipartisan negotiations produced the authorizing legislation for these programs, and it is the same with this follow-up measure today.

I commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) as well as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the subcommittee Chair, for their leadership on this successful committee effort. Unfortunately, the need for noncontroversial technical corrections is not the only obstacle preventing the medical device user fee program from fulfilling its potential. It is important for colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be aware that continuation of the user fee program, and it is this program that enables patients to receive cutting-edge medical devices on a timely basis, the continuation of the user fee program does in fact hinge on the appropriations process.

User fees do no incremental good if they supplant, rather than supplement, Federal spending. As in the successful prescription drug user fee program, the continuation of user fees depends on sufficient annual appropriations. Last year's appropriation for medical device reviews was insufficient to sustain the medical device user fee program in an optimal way. If this year's appropriation does not address that shortfall, the user fee program will likely fold.

Hard work went into establishing this program. The existence of the program enables patients more timely access to medical devices at no additional cost to American taxpayers. We need to make sure the program does not indeed fold.

I hope the President's budget includes sufficient funding for the user fee program, and I hope we follow through by allocating sufficient dollars to keep this program alive.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), one of the architects of this bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished ranking member and my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) who, together we introduced this legislation, H.R. 3493. I appreciate always his cooperation and that of his staff. This is not the first effort where we have worked together and been successful. We are proud of that and proud of the work that has come out of our committee.

This bill makes important technical corrections. While it may seem a little dull and dry, the technical corrections really enhance the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act which was a very important piece of legislation which allowed major new programs that really streamline the Food and Drug Administration's medical device approval process to be actually implemented. This bipartisan bill is about making sure that patients are, one, able to safely benefit from new medical technologies and, secondly, as quickly as possible. As medical technologies become more advanced, it takes more attention and resources to ensure that these products are safe and effective.

Last year, the House overwhelmingly passed the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act which helps the FDA get lifesaving products to patients faster, as well as resources to the agency to assure this. Specifically under that law, and I think it is important to underscore what was in that law and why we are bolstering it, the importance of bolstering it today, the medical device industry agreed to pay fees to the FDA for every product it proposes to market. These fees will help the FDA hire additional staff, much needed, I might add, and to purchase needed equipment so that they can review the products on a timely basis.

Secondly, the resources were increased for additional inspections of manufacturing plants and facilities, a very, very important part of that legislation, as well as the creation of an Office of Combination Products to shepherd advanced products, such as devices with drug coating, through the approval process. This new administrative flexibility allows the FDA to devote its resources to the devices that patients need most.

Finally, the bill created a way to regulate what are known as reprocessed devices. Some people may have tuned into nationally televised programs where the national discovery was made that reprocessed devices were being used in hospitals unbeknownst to doctors and unbeknownst to patients. I did not like that when I heard it, and we addressed it in the bill.

The bill requires that reprocessed products undergo additional scrutiny by the FDA and that they be held to the highest standards that the FDA can apply. It also required that doctors, who are often unaware that they are using a reprocessed device, be informed about the reused device so that they can, in turn, inform their patients about the reused device.

This Technical Corrections Act is an important bill because it is ultimately, Mr. Speaker, about patients, and it will implement the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act as Congress fully intended.

One of the best parts of doing something like this is to work with the very able people that helped make it possible, so I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), chairman

of our full committee; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), our distinguished subcommittee chairman; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking member of our full committee; the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and certainly my colleague, who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health.

I also want to thank several staff people: Pat Ronan of Chairman TAUZIN's staff; Alan Eisenberg of the office of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD); John Ford of the office of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL); and Anne Witt of the office of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). Without all of these good people, we would not be here today doing this. So we have come a long way, and I think we have created something that will serve our country very well.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this, to make it unanimous. We will then accomplish yet something else very good and important for the American people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I also would like to thank my very able staff member, Mr. Alan Eisenberg, for his tireless work on this and so many other issues.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a supporter of H.R. 3493 which amends Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. This legislation is necessary to clarify certain provisions relating to the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002. I am pleased to see that this bill enjoys broad bipartisan support in this body after it was passed by unanimous consent in the Senate. It is imperative that we continually update and rework the regulations that govern the use of our Nation's medical devices.

I would also like to recognize my distinguished colleague Representative SHERROD BROWN and affirm his view on the necessity of providing additional appropriations funding for the Medical Device User Program. In the last series of appropriations this vital program was under funded and was left with a potentially dangerous mandate. While H.R. 3493 is a timely bill, we must make sure to provide the necessary resources for all medical device programs in order to make this legislation truly effective.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Medical Devices Technical Corrections Act. This bipartisan legislation makes technical corrections to the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002, which I was proud to cosponsor.

The Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act has several key components that will result in a better, more efficient process in which the Food and Drug Administration works with medical device companies to review applications, inspect device plants, and ensure that reprocessed devices are used in a safe and identifiable fashion. The user fees included in the legislation are intended to provide FDA with additional resources to review new or updated device applications more quickly, but also more effectively. Every day,

medical devices save or improve the lives of patients around the world and this legislation will mean that patients will have access to new and improved devices in a much timelier fashion.

Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the Energy and Commerce Committee worked to enact the original bill and the legislation before us today should be a model for future legislative efforts. Because of the truly bipartisan process, the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act enjoys widespread support which will work to ensure its success. I commend the medical device community and my colleagues for their efforts to improve the delivery of health care to millions of Americans.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3493, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2004, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY JOSE MARIA AZNAR, PRESIDENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SPAIN

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, February 4, 2004, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Jose Maria Aznar, President of the Government of Spain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 610, NASA WORKFORCE FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-406) on the resolution (H. Res. 502) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 610) to amend the provisions of title 5, United States Code, to provide for workforce flexibilities and certain Federal personnel provisions relating to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1920, BANKRUPTCY ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2004

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-407) on the resolution (H. Res. 503) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1920) to extend for 6 months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1385, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 1493, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote; the second will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

BREAST CANCER STAMP EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1385, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1385, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 331, nays 1, not voting 100, as follows:

Aderholt	Foley	Matsui
Akin	Fossella	McCarthy (MO)
Allen	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)
Andrews	Franks (AZ)	McCollum
Baca	Frelinghuysen	McCotter
Baird	Garrett (NJ)	McCrery
Baker	Gerlach	McDermott
Baldwin	Gibbons	McGovern
Barrett (SC)	Gilchrest	McHugh
Bartlett (MD)	Gillmor	McInnis
Barton (TX)	Gingrey	McKeon
Bass	Gonzalez	McNulty
Beauprez	Goode	Meehan
Becerra	Goodlatte	Meek (FL)
Bell	Gordon	Menendez
Bereuter	Goss	Mica
Berkley	Granger	Michaud
Berman	Graves	Millender-
Berry	Green (TX)	McDonald
Biggert	Green (WI)	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Greenwood	Miller, Gary
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Moore
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Moran (KS)
Bishop (UT)	Hall	Moran (VA)
Blackburn	Harman	Murphy
Blumenauer	Harris	Musgrave
Blunt	Hart	Myrick
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Napolitano
Boehner	Hayes	Neal (MA)
Bonilla	Hayworth	Nethercutt
Bonner	Hefley	Neugebauer
Boswell	Hensarling	Ney
Boyd	Herger	Norwood
Bradley (NH)	Hill	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hinchey	Nussle
Brown (OH)	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Brown (SC)	Hoeffel	Obey
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Olver
Ginny	Holden	Osborne
Burgess	Holt	Ose
Burns	Hooley (OR)	Otter
Burton (IN)	Hostettler	Oxley
Cannon	Houghton	Pallone
Cantor	Hoyer	Pascarell
Capito	Hulshof	Pastor
Capps	Inslee	Pearce
Cardin	Isakson	Pelosi
Cardoza	Issa	Pence
Carson (IN)	Istook	Peterson (MN)
Case	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (PA)
Castle	Jackson-Lee	Petri
Chabot	(TX)	Pickering
Chocola	Jefferson	Pitts
Clay	John	Platts
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Pomeroy
Cole	Johnson, E. B.	Porter
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Portman
Conyers	Jones (OH)	Pryce (OH)
Cooper	Kanjorski	Putnam
Cox	Kaptur	Quinn
Cramer	Keller	Radanovich
Crane	Kelly	Rahall
Crenshaw	Kennedy (MN)	Ramstad
Crowley	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Cubin	Kildee	Regula
Davis (AL)	Kilpatrick	Rehberg
Davis (CA)	Kind	Renzi
Davis (FL)	King (IA)	Reynolds
Davis (IL)	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Davis (TN)	Kirk	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Tom	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Ross
DeLauro	Kolbe	Ruppersberger
DeLay	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Deutsch	Lampson	Ryun (KS)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Diaz-Balart, M.	Larsen (WA)	Sanders
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Saxton
Dooley (CA)	Latham	Schakowsky
Doyle	Lee	Schiff
Dreier	Levin	Schrock
Dunn	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Ehlers	Linder	Sessions
Emanuel	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Emerson	Lofgren	Shaw
Engel	Lowey	Shays
Eshoo	Lucas (KY)	Sherman
Etheridge	Lucas (OK)	Sherwood
Evans	Lynch	Shimkus
Everett	Majette	Shuster
Farr	Maloney	Simmons
Feeney	Manzullo	Simpson
Ferguson	Markey	Skelton
Filner	Marshall	Smith (MI)
Flake	Matheson	Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX) Thompson (CA) Walden (OR)
 Smith (WA) Thompson (MS) Walsh
 Snyder Thornberry Watt
 Solis Tiahrt Waxman
 Spratt Tierney Weiner
 Stearns Toomey Weldon (FL)
 Stenholm Towns Weller
 Strickland Turner (OH) Whitfield
 Stupak Turner (TX) Wicker
 Sweeney Udall (CO) Wilson (NM)
 Tancred Udall (NM) Woolsey
 Tanner Upton Wu
 Taylor (MS) Van Hollen Wynn
 Taylor (NC) Velazquez Young (AK)
 Terry Visclosky
 Thomas Vitter

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—100

Abercrombie Forbes Payne
 Ackerman Ford Pombo
 Alexander Frost Price (NC)
 Bachus Gallegly Reyes
 Ballance Gephardt Rodriguez
 Ballenger Gutknecht Rogers (KY)
 Bono Hastings (FL) Rohrabacher
 Boozman Hobson Rothman
 Boucher Honda Roybal-Allard
 Brady (PA) Hunter Royce
 Brown, Corrine Hyde Rush
 Burr Israel Ryan (OH)
 Buyer Jenkins Sabo
 Calvert Johnson (IL) Sanchez, Linda
 Camp Jones (NC) T.
 Capuano Kingston Sandlin
 Carson (OK) Kleczka Scott (GA)
 Carter Kucinich Serrano
 Clyburn Lantos Slaughter
 Costello LaTourette Souder
 Culberson Leach Stark
 Cummings Lewis (CA) Sullivan
 Cunningham Lipinski Tauscher
 Davis, Jo Ann McIntyre Tauzin
 DeFazio Meeks (NY) Tiberi
 DeGette Miller (MI) Wamp
 Delahunt Miller (NC) Waters
 DeMint Miller, George Watson
 Dingell Mollohan Weldon (PA)
 Doggett Murtha Wexler
 Doolittle Nadler Wilson (SC)
 Duncan Northup Wolf
 English Ortiz Young (FL)
 Fattah Owens

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1855

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL DEVICES TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3493, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3493, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair announces that this will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 0, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—333

Ferguson Marshall
 Filner Matheson
 Flake Matsui
 Foley McCarthy (MO)
 Fossella McCarthy (NY)
 Frank (MA) McCollum
 Franks (AZ) McCotter
 Frelinghuysen McCreery
 Garrett (NJ) McDermott
 Gerlach McGovern
 Gibbons McHugh
 Gilchrest McInnis
 Gillmor McKeon
 Gingrey McNulty
 Gonzalez Meehan
 Goode Menendez
 Goodlatte Mica
 Gordon Michaud
 Goss Millender-
 Granger McDonald
 Graves Miller (FL)
 Green (TX) Miller, Gary
 Green (WI) Moore
 Greenwood Moran (KS)
 Grijalva Moran (VA)
 Gutierrez Hall
 Harman Murphy
 Harris Myrick
 Hart Napolitano
 Hastings (WA) Neal (MA)
 Hayes Nethercutt
 Hayworth Neugebauer
 Hefley Ney
 Hensarling Norwood
 Herger Nunes
 Hill Nussle
 Hinchey Oberstar
 Hinojosa Obey
 Hoeft Olver
 Hoekstra Osborne
 Holden Ose
 Holt Otter
 Hooley (OR) Oxley
 Hostettler Pallone
 Hoyer Pascrell
 Hulshof Pastor
 Inslee Paul
 Isakson Pearce
 Issa Pelosi
 Istook Pence
 Jackson (IL) Peterson (MN)
 Jackson-Lee Peterson (PA)
 (TX) Petri
 Jefferson Pickering
 John Pitts
 Johnson (CT) Platts
 Johnson, E. B. Pomeroy
 Johnson, Sam Porter
 Jones (OH) Portman
 Kanjorski Pryce (OH)
 Kaptur Putnam
 Keller Quinn
 Kelly Radanovich
 Kennedy (MN) Rahall
 Kennedy (RI) Ramstad
 Kildee Rangel
 Kilpatrick Regula
 Kind Rehberg
 King (IA) Renzi
 King (NY) Reynolds
 Kirk Rogers (AL)
 Kline Rogers (MI)
 Knollenberg Ros-Lehtinen
 Kolbe Ross
 LaHood Ruppelberger
 Lampson Ryan (WI)
 Langevin Ryun (KS)
 Larsen (WA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Larson (CT) Sanders
 Latham Saxton
 Lee Schakowsky
 Levin Schiff
 Lewis (GA) Schrock
 Lewis (KY) Scott (VA)
 Linder Sensenbrenner
 LoBiondo Sessions
 Lofgren Shadegg
 Lowey Shaw
 Lucas (KY) Shays
 Lucas (OK) Sherman
 Lynch Sherwood
 Majette Shimkus
 Maloney Shuster
 Manzullo Simpson
 Markey Skelton

Smith (MI) Terry
 Smith (NJ) Thomas
 Smith (TX) Thompson (CA)
 Smith (WA) Thompson (MS)
 Snyder Thornberry
 Solis Tiahrt
 Spratt Tierney
 Stearns Toomey
 Stenholm Towns
 Strickland Turner (OH)
 Stupak Turner (TX)
 Sweeney Udall (CO)
 Tancred Udall (NM)
 Tanner Upton
 Taylor (MS) Van Hollen
 Taylor (NC) Velazquez

NOT VOTING—99

Abercrombie Gallegly Price (NC)
 Ackerman Gephardt Reyes
 Alexander Gutknecht Rodriguez
 Bachus Hastings (FL) Rogers (KY)
 Ballance Hobson Rohrabacher
 Ballenger Honda Rothman
 Bono Houghton Roybal-Allard
 Boozman Hunter Royce
 Boucher Hyde Rush
 Brady (PA) Israel Ryan (OH)
 Brown, Corrine Jenkins Sabo
 Burr Johnson (IL) Sanchez, Linda
 Buyer Jones (NC) T.
 Calvert Kingston Sandlin
 Camp Kleczka Scott (GA)
 Capuano Kucinich Serrano
 Carson (OK) Lantos Simmons
 Clyburn LaTourette Slaughter
 Costello Leach Souder
 Culberson Lewis (CA) Stark
 Cunningham Lipinski Sullivan
 Davis, Jo Ann McIntyre Tauzin
 DeFazio Meeks (NY) Tiberi
 DeGette Miller (MI) Wamp
 Delahunt Miller (NC) Waters
 Dingell Miller, George Watson
 Doggett Mollohan Weldon (PA)
 Doolittle Murtha Wexler
 Duncan Nadler Wilson (SC)
 English Northup Wolf
 Fattah Ortiz Young (FL)
 Forbes Owens
 Ford Payne
 Frost Pombo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1913

So (two thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2682

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the following names removed as cosponsors of H.R. 2682: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1915

GOP AGENDA ON UNINSURED OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, just last week in his State of the Union Address, the President brought before the House a three-point plan for helping reduce the number of uninsured Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I was very grateful to hear the President's discussion of this plan. Of course, here in this House in November this year past, as part of the Medicare Modernization Act that we passed November 22, we also included a provision for health savings accounts.

Health savings accounts, Mr. Speaker, are a program that has been near and dear to my heart for many years. My last 5 years of medical practice, I had a medical savings account, and I saw firsthand the value of being able to build that account, to build those dollars in a tax-free, tax-deferred account completely dedicated to health care needs.

The new health savings accounts will give Americans more choice in their health care. Of course, they can choose their own physician and consult with their doctor about services they need and services they can afford, but it puts the consumer, it puts the patient, back in the driver's seat and actually gives them a stake, not just in their health outcome, but how their health dollars are spent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an extremely important point. I believe that putting consumers back in charge of how health care expenditures are made will be one way of reducing the cost of delivering care.

Health savings accounts will give Americans health care that is much more portable than the current employer-derived accounts. As over half of all Americans receive their health care coverage through their employer, health savings accounts become even more important because if someone loses their job, of course they lose health care coverage; but with the health savings account, that money obviously would be rolled over and would continue to be there to cover the worker or their families.

Health savings accounts promote savings and wealth generation. Currently, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Americans save only 2 percent of their annual income. The average in Western industrialized nations is around 10 percent. But with health savings accounts,

we will promote savings and will promote wealth generation.

Mr. Speaker, I need to point out, this is wealth that can be passed on from generation to generation. It is actually owned by that individual. It is not some program that when a person dies, that program goes away.

Many health savings accounts generate a 4 percent return on investment, and with the miracle of compound interest, Mr. Speaker, that money can grow significantly over time. Of course, as the market continues to improve, some health savings accounts could generate a much higher return.

Another program that the President mentioned and actually is no stranger to this House because we passed H.R. 660 last June, but Association Health Plans, Mr. Speaker, I believe, are a powerful tool in allowing small businesses to continue to provide employer-derived insurance for their employees.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, small businesses are handicapped by high insurance prices and State mandates when shopping for health insurance. But Association Health Plans would allow bona fide business and trade associations to negotiate health care coverage rates with employers utilizing a much larger pool of employees, not just the individual small business employee pool. Removal of some State mandates, which a large majority of businesses avoid under ERISA, would assist small businesses by giving them the ability to shop for health coverage that meets the needs of their employees without the inclusion of extraneous and expensive State-mandated benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the final program that was mentioned by the President in his State of the Union address, that is actually a bill that has been introduced by our neighbor, Kay Granger, in Fort Worth, involves tax credits for the uninsured.

Tax credits are perhaps the best way and the most immediate way to help the 43 million Americans who have not been able to purchase health insurance. Fully refundable, prepaid tax credits would give low-income individuals and families immediate purchasing power in the health insurance market. Some studies estimate that there could be a 50 to 80 percent reduction in the number of uninsured Americans if the Federal Government made available a fully refundable health insurance tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that we can do, and we have done in this House, but the other thing we can do at the Federal level to help with the problem of the uninsured is to reduce the enormous cost of the liability system, that burden that is placed on the health care delivery system in this country. I know this House has acted on that this past year, but our work is not through, and we need to encourage those Members of the other body who may be so inclined to move that legislation through their body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to report back on the last 3 weeks I spent in my district, traveling the district, visiting with the 13 hospital and medical centers that are in my district, to talk to them about the Prescription Drug and Medicare Modernization Act that we passed here in November and the President signed into law.

I would like to report they have been very pleased with what we did here in Congress. The doctors are pleased with the reimbursement increase they are going to receive, and our hospitals are pleased with what we have done. I have a rural district, and the rural package that we put forth for these hospitals is very important to their financial well-being.

But as we talked about what we did in the bill, the discussion quickly turned to what we have not done here in Congress. In the House, we have attempted to do it three times, passed legislation to reform medical malpractice, but it has not passed in the other body, and as I talked to these CEOs, doctors and nurses, we talked about the stories in various areas of the district.

In Indiana County, for instance, the home of Jimmy Stewart, a very well-respected and beloved orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Paul Burton, left Pennsylvania for California 6 months ago due to the medical malpractice crisis in the State of Pennsylvania.

In Blair County, Pennsylvania, the largest hospital in my district, the Altoona Hospital, in 1999 they paid approximately \$1 million in malpractice insurance; last year, that number jumped up to almost \$3 million, and not a penny of it was used to help patients.

Pennsylvania physicians paid over \$350 million in malpractice insurance premiums, which ranks them second in the Nation, nearly 10 percent of the Nation's total, despite having less than 5 percent of the Nation's physicians.

There are countless stories like these, not only in my district, but across this country. In 2002, an American Medical Association analysis found that 12 States were in crisis. That number has now reached 19, and they include Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Illinois, Texas, Wyoming, Nevada, Oregon and Washington. Together, these States represent almost half the population of the entire country.

America's medical liability system is broken. Jury awards are a big part of that problem. In 2002, 52 percent of all awards were for \$1 million or more. Today that average is over \$3.5 million. In the city of Philadelphia, juries awarded more than the entire State of California, which is outrageous. If left unrestrained, these jury awards will continue to spiral out of control.

One of the most serious consequences of the medical malpractice crisis is patients' access to care. Physicians are being forced to limit services, retire early or move to other States where medical malpractice reform has taken place.

During my tour, I met an ear, nose and throat physician who is trying to recruit another doctor for his practice. He told me that when he goes to these conferences and speaks to the residents or other physicians, as soon as they hear he is from Pennsylvania, they say, "No way." In fact, last year not a single orthopedic resident that was trained in Pennsylvania stayed in Pennsylvania to practice medicine due to the medical malpractice situation in our State.

Not just doctors and hospitals pay for this medical malpractice insurance, but all patients pay the escalating costs of this crisis. Health and Human Services estimates that medical liability costs add \$60 billion to \$108 billion to the total cost of health care each year, \$47 billion annually to what the Federal Government pays for Medicare, Medicaid, VA and health care for Federal employees.

Costs are further increased by additional unnecessary tests and treatments that are performed by physicians practicing defensive medicine, trying to avoid being sued.

The solution to all of this is reform. The House passed, as I said, three times, medical liability reform, proposing a cap of \$250,000 on noneconomic damages. The HEALTH Act, H.R. 5, of which I am a cosponsor, which we passed in the spring, would still allow for unlimited economic damages, while also establishing a reasonable limit on the pain and suffering awards.

I salute the President for bringing this to the forefront in his State of the

Union message and as he traveled the country the past couple of days talking about the need for medical malpractice reform in this country. I would also urge the other body to move this important legislation, so that we can give the relief needed, the much-needed relief, to our health care system.

JUSTICE AND EQUITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the Congress to correct an injustice that has been inflicted upon a group of World War II veterans, the World War II United States Merchant Mariners.

World War II Merchant Mariners suffered the highest casualty rate of any of the branches of services while they delivered troops, tanks, food, airplanes, fuel and other needed supplies to every theater of the war. Compared to the large number of men and women serving in World War II, the numbers of Merchant Mariners were small, but their chance of dying during service was extremely high. Enemy forces sank over 800 ships between 1941 and 1944 alone.

Unfortunately, this group of brave men were denied their rights under the GI Bill of Rights which Congress enacted in 1945. All those who served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force or Coast Guard were recipients of benefits under the GI Bill. The United States Merchant Marine was not included.

Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine became the forgotten service. For four decades, no effort was made to recognize the contribution made by this branch of the Armed Forces. The fact that merchant seamen had borne arms during wartime in the defense of their country did not seem to matter.

No legislation to benefit merchant seamen was passed by Congress until 1988 when the Seaman Acts of 1988 finally granted them the status of veteran and a "watered down" GI Bill of Rights. Some portions of the GI Bill have never been made available to veterans of the Merchant Marine.

While it is impossible to make up for over 40 years of unpaid benefits, I propose a bill that will acknowledge the service of the veterans of the Merchant Marine and offer compensation for years and years of lost benefits. My bill, H.R. 3729, the Belated Thank You to the Merchant Mariners of World War II Act of 2004, would pay each eligible veteran a monthly benefit of \$1,000. That payment would also go to their surviving spouse.

The average age of Merchant Marine veterans is now 81. Many have outlived their savings. A monthly benefit to compensate for the loss of nearly a lifetime of ineligibility for the GI Bill

would be of comfort and would provide some measure of security for veterans of the Merchant Marine.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Ian Allison, Merchant Marine combat veteran, Co-Chairman of the Just Compensation Committee, for bringing to me the plight of the Merchant Mariners. To recognize Mr. Allison, his Co-Chairman, Henry Van Gemert, and the thousands of veterans of the United States Merchant Marine, I today introduce the Belated Thank You to the Merchant Mariners of World War II Act of 2004, today, January 27, 2004, the date of Mr. Allison's 84th birthday.

I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this legislation. We can never make up for the years lost, but we can fix the injustice by passing H.R. 3729 as quickly as possible.

TRIBUTE TO MONTEREY CITY COUNCILWOMAN RUTH VREELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in these hallowed halls of Congress to pay tribute to a colleague in public service, Monterey City Councilwoman Ruth Vreeland, killed in an automobile accident on Highway 101 in southern Monterey County just this last Sunday.

What a loss. This 68-year-old woman had the energy of 100 locomotives. Involved in everything, teacher, statewide education activist, 20-year city councilwoman, statewide League of Cities activist, Democratic Party activist, mother, member of various boards. She was always there, always prepared, and always wanting to do more.

Born in Chunking, China, she grew up in Szechwan Province where her parents worked as medical missionaries. Returning to Toronto, Canada, in 1940, and moving to San Francisco where her parents taught at the University of California, Berkeley, Ruth earned a bachelor's degree in arts and education from San Francisco State University. She also met her husband there, Dick Vreeland, and then continued on to the University of San Francisco to earn a master's degree in organizational development.

In 1956, she moved to Monterey Peninsula to teach school, and was elected to the Monterey City Council with the intention of protecting the quality of life in the city of Monterey.

"This town is more than buildings and streets; first it is people," she wrote in her campaign statement. She championed the tearing down of the waterfront buildings so that people could see the Bay where California began. She replaced the buildings with parks and recreational trails, the now highly successful Window on the Bay Project.

She served in a variety of leadership positions, including the League of California Cities Board of Directors, Institute for Local Self-Government, the 20th District Parent-Teacher Association, the Monterey Bay Task Force, Quota International, Women in Municipal Government, Friends Outside of the Monterey County, and the Overall Economic Development Committee of Monterey County.

She was also a Volunteers in Action Board Member, a Monterey City Council member since 1983, an alternate in the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Advisory Council and a former president of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the Monterey Peninsula Concert Association and the Winnie the Pooh Chapter of the Children's Home Society.

□ 1930

She was involved in various organizations.

Tonight, in paying tribute, I would also like to recognize my colleague, the minority leader of the United States House of Representatives, the gentlewoman from San Francisco, California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), in paying tribute to Ruth Vreeland. I thank him, as one who admired her on behalf of so many who learned from her over the years, for my colleague's magnificent tribute to her, which I know he has not finished. I will not take a lot of time because I know he needs the time to put the full tribute into the RECORD.

As one who worked with her for over 25 years in the California Democratic Party, I know of her love of country. She was a true patriot. She loved our country. She loved its people. She loved its natural environment. She loved our civil liberties. She was a model citizen.

My daughter Christine, I know, would want to join with me, who worked with her on the platform committee, in expressing our sympathies to her family in saying that we will remember her with great affection, admiration, and respect.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and thank him for his leadership in presenting the very, very excellent credentials of Ms. Vreeland to our colleagues.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for joining us. I know her family and all her friends and people in elected government will be so touched because she was a big admirer of the gentlewoman. My colleague led the way for women in politics.

Throughout her life, many of these organizations honored her outstanding commitment and service to our Bay community with awards. The Volunteers in Action honored her community service. The Sierra Club honored her for outstanding achievement. Planned

Parenthood named her an Outstanding Woman in Politics. The Monterey Rotary named her an Outstanding Teacher. Furthermore, the Fisherman's Wharf named her the Wharf Rat of the Year in 1995. The California Democratic Party recognized her for outstanding services. J.C. Penney gave her the Golden Rule Award. And the Old Monterey Business Association recognized her for exceptional dedication. The Monterey Civic Club honored her for being a community volunteer. Finally, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments recognized her for 20 years of service.

As I mentioned earlier, and as you can see from this lengthy list of accomplishments, Ruth was always moving, always involved. Her friends wondered if she ever had time to sleep. She adored her family and always seemed to be on her way to visit the next child. In fact, the tragic accident that led to her death occurred as she returned from visiting one of her three daughters, Lauren, Amy and Meslissa. Among the three of them, they have seven of Ruth and Dick's grandchildren.

Ruth and Dick's home blended the elements of Ruth Vreeland's youth in China with Japanese culture that Dick Vreeland picked up in the Army.

She was also involved with various organizations including the Monterey Vista Homeowners Association, Community of Caring, League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women, California Teachers Association, Monterey Bay Teachers Association, Responsible Hospitality, California Elected Women's Association for Education and Research, Monterey Main Street Program, National Organization of Women, Old Monterey Preservation Society, Sierra Club, ACLU, State Theater Preservation Group, Monterey Civic Club, Monterey History and Art Association, American Association for Retired Persons, California Retired Teachers' Association, and the Unitarian Church.

She cooked Chinese food and raised the children to use chopsticks. A proud naturalized citizen from Canada, Vreeland also instilled civic values in her daughters. "She believed in this country because she was naturalized in it and she taught me what patriotism is," her daughter said.

Vreeland also continued to tackle the large-scale problems that had always energized her. The Sierra Club recognized her in the 1980's for fighting offshore drilling and sewage spills. She traveled to Sacramento and Washington to promote education and local government, rising to leadership roles with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments and the League of California Cities.

Vreeland was active in Democratic Party politics and was not afraid to bring progressive political causes to Monterey. She challenged the city in 1988 for not having enough women and minorities in management positions, and a decade later she discouraged the council from subsidizing the Boy Scouts because of its exclusionary policies toward gays.

In the months before her death, Vreeland's last big project was saving education and local government in the face of California's budget crisis, a problem epic enough to discourage even the most ardent community activist.

But not Ruth Vreeland.

America will miss her. She came to this country to do good—we are all better for it and will miss her forever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FOCUSING CONGRESS' ATTENTION ON THE BASIS FOR THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this second session of the 108th Congress, there is a great deal of very important work that remains for us to accomplish.

Primarily, among those things that need to be done is simply this: this Congress needs to focus its attention on the basis for the war in Iraq, why we are there; why that war was carried out; and what were the basic reasons behind it.

We were told initially by the administration that there was a connection between Iraq and the attack on our country of September 11, 2001, and that there was a relationship between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. That has proven to be completely false.

Subsequently, this Congress was told repeatedly, even in classified briefings right here on the floor of the House of Representatives, carried out by the Secretary of Defense and others, that the reason we were going to war in Iraq was because of the fact that Iraq possessed chemical and biological weapons, so-called weapons of mass destruction. And as the President put it, Iraq constituted a deep and ongoing threat to the United States; and as Vice President CHENEY put it, Iraq constitutes an imminent threat to the United States because of these so-called weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons, which were alleged to be in Iraq in large numbers.

We have now come to learn quite clearly that that was wrong, that there were no weapons of mass destruction, no chemical or biological weapons in any significant amount held in Iraq by Saddam Hussein or by anyone else. Many of us knew that. Many of us knew that 15 months ago when this Congress voted on a resolution authorizing the administration to carry out a war in Iraq. We knew it, we said so, and we voted against that resolution.

Nevertheless, many others were taken in by what was coming out of the White House and elsewhere within the administration. And they voted for the war in Iraq, many of them, based on the belief that they were being told

the truth about the possession of weapons of mass destruction by the regime of Saddam Hussein. Again, now we know very clearly that that was not the case and that the administration knew it was not the case.

Most recently we have the report from the outgoing head of the American weapons inspection team in Iraq, David Kay. David Kay has now completed his report as he retires from that position, and he has said to us very, very clearly in that report that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, no chemical or biological weapons; that the biological and chemical weapons that were there, many of them were destroyed in the first Gulf War in 1991 and the rest were discovered and destroyed by the ongoing United Nations weapons inspection program.

We also have information from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which has done a very comprehensive study of the issue of so-called weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has set forth in a very detailed report that there were no weapons of mass destruction held by the Saddam Hussein regime not since the end of the first Gulf War, and shortly thereafter they were destroyed as a result of weapons inspection program, the U.N. weapons inspection program.

Again, another clear indication that the premise that was laid forth by the administration to this Congress in order to get a resolution passed authorizing the carrying out of that war was false. It was fabricated. And this Congress was misled.

That leaves us with the very serious problem of finding out why that was done and who was responsible for doing it. That is important because of the situation we currently find ourselves in in Iraq, including the situation we find ourselves in with regard to the war on terrorism.

Our attention has been diverted away from al Qaeda and away from the war on terrorism. And we find ourselves in Iraq in a war that has already cost more than 500 American lives. The lives of more than 500 American servicemen and -women have been lost. Another more than 2,500 American servicemen and -women have been seriously wounded, all on the basis of pretense.

Therefore, we must conduct a complete and thorough investigation as to what happened, and that investigation must commence immediately.

WE NEED MORE MILITARY END STRENGTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, last year I stood in this well and called on my colleagues to support an increase in

the Nation's military end strength, the number of people in our uniformed services. I am pleased that my colleagues rose to the challenge and recognized the increased pressures that have been placed on our servicemembers. As a result, Congress last year authorized an increase in end strength of 2,400 soldiers for the Army and 300 airmen for the Air Force.

Unfortunately, this increase is just a small down payment on what the services, particularly the Army, need in order to meet today's increased operational tempo. Nearly a decade ago, Congress heard from the Army leadership about the need for an increase in end strength. The then Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, General Ted Stroup, testified before the Committee on Armed Services that the Army needed 25,000 more soldiers to meet ongoing operational needs. Our ongoing operations in Afghanistan and Iraq have only made the need for additional troops more imperative. I think we need an additional 40,000-person end strength increase in the Army alone, not to mention the other services.

Many servicemembers who were sent to Afghanistan to search for Osama bin Laden and defeat the al Qaeda went home after their tours only to be told to pack their bags because they were going to Iraq for a year. Brigades from the 10th Mountain Division and from the 101st Airborne Division were sent to Afghanistan. They returned home for a relatively short duration, and then they were sent to Iraq to prosecute Operation Iraqi Freedom. If we continue these back-to-back deployments, we will literally break the force. That is something we as a Nation can ill afford to let happen.

And now our military is about to embark on the largest troop rotation in the history of our country. I wish I could say that the replacement troops will be fresh, but the hard truth is that many of them will be returning to Iraq for consecutive tours. If we had enough people in the military, back-to-back tours in Iraq would not be necessary. It is important for everyone to understand that in the new force rotation into Iraq, National Guardsmen and Reservists will comprise about 40 percent of the force there.

We are using the National Guard and Reserve as never before, and we have to be careful not to put such strains on these citizen soldiers that they leave in droves or that recruiting suffers.

I was in Missouri recently and met with one wife of a National Guardsman now serving in Iraq. She told me when her husband returns from overseas he will be getting out of the National Guard and as many as one-third of folks in her husband's unit will be too.

This may be anecdotal evidence of what is going on in our Reserve components, but it is certainly cause for concern. The increased demands being placed upon our troops in uniform call into question the ability of our forces to meet its commitments in other

parts of the world. If conflict erupted on the Korean peninsula while these brigades are in southwest Asia, our ability to respond quickly would likely be compromised.

Recently, Lieutenant General John Riggs, a senior Army officer, stated that the Army must be substantially increased to meet its global commitments. Yet the Secretary of Defense continues to maintain that the services have enough end strength already to meet their responsibilities and that the increased demands on the troops is only a spike or temporary increase. As a result, my expectation is that the President's budget will not include any permanent end strength increase but will permit only temporary overages associated with our current deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Department of Defense believes that additional servicemembers are not needed because we proved that our troops can vastly overpower an enemy with speed agility and power in war. The problem is that we are no longer in that type of war. We are rebuilding a Nation from the ground up. That kind of undertaking takes people. And right now we simply do not have enough.

There is simply no substitute for having boots on the ground. To get the job done right I am pleased that a number of my colleagues have recognized the importance of increasing end strength. A number of them have written to the President and the Secretary of Defense calling for an increase in end strength. Others like the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) have introduced legislation to this effect.

We must, we can, and we will in this Congress pass an authorization bill authorizing for appropriation additional end strength for the United States Army as well as the other services.

FULL DISCLOSURE FOR CLAIM OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION BY IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all associate myself with the very thoughtful message of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) in terms of his very plain-talking message about our military.

□ 1945

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and I had the pleasure of visiting a number of them most recently in Iraq and I think a strong debate on this question will be important. Many people believe that those of us who have a difference of opinion for or against the war or for or against the approach that the war took, do not have a total agreement on the necessity of strengthening the young men and women who are in our Armed

Forces. So I look forward to debating this very thoughtful presentation and associate myself with his remarks and the legislative initiatives; and I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his leadership.

Let me say that I also associate myself with the gentleman's remarks as it relates to the toughness, as it relates to the battle of our Reserve troops and others who have offered their service for a number of years and have been called to duty; and many of them are not able to determine whether they will be in for 6 months or for a year or 18 months or 2 years.

We certainly have the protection of their jobs, but in many instances we are still having disagreements or having to advocate for our reservists to their various employers, some of whom are concerned or unsteady about keeping the reservists' jobs for them and, therefore, certainly undermining the family unit and the ability of that reservist to provide income and support for his or her family.

I happen to be a supporter of the legislation that would allow reservists to retire at 55, just as we allow the active military to retire at 55. It seems unlikely that we would lengthen the time of service for reservists who are apt to be called into battle at any moment. We have lost lives of those who are reservists in Iraq. The numbers are mounting, and they are on the front line.

When I went to Iraq, there were many who were skilled in many other aspects other than combat or police work; and lo and behold, they were being used for service that they were not trained for. So I associate myself with those remarks and certainly support the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for his efforts in support of our veterans, because we have long been overdue in the full support of our veterans who are willing to give their full measure. And as they are able to come back to our communities, the very fact that they are willing to give the ultimate sacrifice, we should make good on our promise, which is to continue to provide them with benefits on a continuous basis.

Let me also add my congratulations to the veterans hospital that is in my district. We just added the Fischer House. Congratulations to the Fischer family and thank them for their support and all the leaders in Texas that helped bring about this new Fischer House in one of the largest veterans hospitals in our State. And that is, of course, a facility for the families who have come for the long-term wounded to be able to stay at a place of comfort without, if you will, providing an unnecessary financial burden when they are already suffering from the ills of their loved one, whether they are wounded by way of their service in Iraq or suffering with other conditions.

So I am very grateful to our community leaders who helped bring the Fischer House about in my congress-

sional district and commit myself to continue to work with them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we bring sunlight where sunlight is needed, and today and in the weeks and months to come I am going to take my place on this floor and remind this Congress of its constitutional responsibility. And, in fact, I am going to take off and challenge anyone, first, take off any discussion of a partisan hat and challenge anyone that wishes to make this a partisan issue each step of the way, because I believe that this is so devastating and so much a challenge to the constitutional integrity of this Nation.

And, more importantly, in this Congress I believe that we must shed ourselves and step away from anyone declaring this to be partisan or anyone suggesting it is partisan, because once you begin the partisan debate, I know what happens: You immediately cease any sort of true effort for the Speaker of this House to address the responsibilities of this Congress, and that is to thoroughly investigate Dr. David Kay's report that we have heard over the last few days and that of the Carnegie Institute regarding weapons of mass destruction.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to call for full congressional hearings, public hearings, not just in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on the Judiciary, to ensure that we review the questions that David Kay has raised the lack of evidence and intelligence for weapons of mass destruction and the representation, as I close, Mr. Speaker, to the Congress and the American people by this administration that we must go to war on that basis.

Full congressional hearings, no independent commission, full congressional hearings.

SEARCH FOR THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, last week during the State of the Union address President Bush spoke to us about the Iraqi War and described how the Kay report, the Dr. David Kay report, indicated dozens of instances of what the President called weapons of mass destruction-related program activities.

Now, I am not sure what a weapons of mass destruction-related program activity is, but I do know what it is not. It is not a weapon of mass destruction, because we have not found weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. And, in fact, David Kay himself has said so. He has resigned his position as the United States Chief Weapons Inspector in Iraq, working for the CIA.

He has stated that in his opinion, Iraq does not have stockpiles of chem-

ical weapons of mass destruction or biological weapons of mass destruction, that Iraq does not have nuclear weapons, and any nuclear program was rudimentary in nature, according to Dr. Kay. He feels that these stockpiles do not exist now and did not exist before we went to war with Iraq in March of 2003.

Now, this is a startling conclusion from our Chief Weapons Inspector because it is so different from what the Bush administration told us in the fall of 2002 in the run-up to the congressional vote of whether or not to give congressional authority to the President to use military authority to deal with what was described as the imminent threat to peace, to regional peace and world peace and to the United States, the imminent threat of the use of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I voted to give the President that authority based upon the representations of the administration because I wanted to disarm Saddam Hussein of those weapons of mass destruction. Now, we have finally captured Saddam Hussein, and I am glad that we have; I am glad he is out of power. I believe both Iraq and America are better off now that he is in custody. But, Mr. Speaker, we have not found those weapons of mass destruction; and we now have a report from Dr. Kay that those weapons of mass destruction did not exist and they do not exist today.

Hussein had weapons of mass destruction in the 1980s. We know that because he used them in murderous ways against his own citizens, the Kurds in northern Iraq, and he used them to murder tens of thousands of Iranian citizens. But the issue is not what he had in the 1980s. The issue is whether he had such stockpiles in 2002 and 2003. We were told with complete certainty by the President, by the Vice President, I was told with 20 other Members of the House in a briefing in the White House on October 2, 2002, by Condoleezza Rice and George Tenet that there was complete certainty that Iraq possessed these weapons of mass destruction. And based upon those representations, I voted with many of my colleagues to give the President that war authority.

Now, it is now clear that there were half-truths and deceptions from the administration as well as mistakes from the Intelligence Community. And I stand here tonight to call for an independent investigation, an independent review, of both the work product of the Intelligence Community of the United States and the work of the administration policymakers that stated with such clarity that we faced an imminent threat from Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

Clearly the American people were misled. Clearly the Congress was misled. I was misled by the Bush administration and by the United States intelligence agencies.

The President and the Vice President continue to want the American people

to believe that there was this threat and is this threat of weapons of mass destruction. The President talked about WMD-related program activities last week without clarifying what they were. The Vice President continues to insist that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. These statements are contrary to the report of the Weapons Inspector, Dr. Kay.

I call for an independent investigation and review so that we can get to the bottom and find out the truth.

JOBS AND THE PRESIDENTIAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight while Americans are watching the New Hampshire primary in anticipation of new leadership for our Nation, they are watching and waiting for the new budget proposals from President Bush. President Bush came to our Toledo community last week, the day after he delivered the State of the Union address right here in this Chamber.

He ran into a hornet's nest. The community college where he spoke had just announced layoffs in the workforce training field the President was there to highlight. The unemployment in Toledo had just increased to 8.4 percent. Our part of the country has been hit extremely hard by the jobless recovery. We have more than 300,000 unemployed workers in the State of Ohio, and that, of course, does not even count the workers who have given up looking.

The family-owned tool and die shops that dot the landscape of the Great Lakes region are dying. I received an e-mail last week from one of these small business owners telling me about the devastation in the tool and die sector. "I have something that most of you should be concerned about in Congress. I just counted the auction brochures I have collected since February 1, 2002, until January 22, 2004. Would you believe 629 auctions?" And those are just the ones this businessman received.

He says, "Our President thinks that everything is great and our economy is bouncing back and we will all be in the bucks this year. I have received a report that estimates 50 percent of the shops in the Detroit area will fold by the end of 2004. So how do you get this message up to Washington? I guess we need to fire up the voters and clean house this fall. Have a good day, Larry."

In his State of the Union address, President Bush failed to mention extending unemployment benefits. This is a huge issue in our part of the country. People have paid for those benefits and they do not understand why the Republicans would refuse to extend unemployment benefits. They certainly do not understand why the Republicans refuse to allow even a vote on extending unemployment benefits.

In the short term, unemployment benefits are highly stimulative for our local economy. They prevent a cratering of consumer demand, and we all know that the consumer is propping up this weak U.S. economy. In the long term, a countercyclical program for public works jobs could help a lot. Investing in our communities and putting people to work so that our deficit starts to come down makes sense.

Just replacing one city's, Toledo's, wastewater treatment system, the bill for that \$400 million. Indeed, that is double the \$250 million the President said he wants to spend nationwide on new job training programs. Investment in public works can put people to work. Frankly, we have people out of work now who already have the skills needed to assume a job.

□ 2000

They just do not have the jobs.

I just visited Sunoco Refining in my district. They had advertised for 10 people in that company; 2,400 people applied. That is a staggering indicator of how many people are looking for work in just one place in America.

A news article in the Grand Rapids, Michigan, paper just north of where we live announced the closure of Electrolux, a household name in this country. They make vacuum cleaners; 2,700 workers will be terminated. Their jobs are leaving for Mexico.

What kind of strange world is it when an American legend company like Electrolux that made vacuums that are bought by our own citizens, but then those jobs move to Mexico and made there by workers who make a dollar an hour but cannot afford to buy the vacuum cleaners because they are all shipped back here to the United States, what kind of sense does that make?

We have seen this system time and again. The people in Mexico who have the jobs that the people in Ohio used to do do not make enough money to buy the very products they make. Americans lose their jobs to Mexico, and they have to shop more at discount stores such as Wal-Mart that are filled with goods made by people who had the jobs that the shoppers used to have. It is really interesting. We are outsourcing that production.

So the question is, are we going to be a Nation of workers, builders and producers, or are we going to be a Nation of discount shoppers looking for that last bargain while wondering how to survive without a decent wage and without health care coverage? That is really the choice of this year's Presidential race.

Mr. Speaker, I am surely glad this is an election year. It is time for America's voters to really ring in a hopeful and really productive new year for our country.

The article I referred to earlier I will include at this point in this RECORD.

[From the Grand Rapids Press, Jan. 17, 2004]
WHATEVER IT TAKES—CITY IS DOWN BUT NOT OUT OVER ELECTROLUX

(By John Hogan, Matt VandeBunte and Julia Bauer)

The thermometer outside Greenville's Chemical Bank registered a bone-rattling 2 degrees at daybreak Friday, although morning commuters didn't need a sign to tell them of the chill.

Three miles away, pickups with cold, anxious Electrolux workers idled in snow-covered parking lots. Even though these third-shift workers punched out at 7 a.m., they waited 30 minutes to learn whether their jobs were heading 1,400 miles south, where it was a relatively balmy 51 degrees. Electrolux worker Jerry Cannon was not one of them.

The longtime Greenville resident decided he would rather sip coffee at Mike Huckleberry's restaurant a mile away.

"It's kind of hard to make yourself go to work when you know what's coming," said Cannon, a welder trying to raise four teenagers on \$15.61 an hour. "I think Electrolux knew Oct. 21 what they were going to do. I wish they would just have told us."

Indeed, Friday's "official" 7:30 a.m. announcement by Swedish-based Electrolux that it will close Montcalm County's largest employer in 2005 was anticlimactic.

Townpeople and employees saw the handwriting on the wall—notably the corporate statement one week before that a city/state incentive package fell far short of an \$81 million annual goal, the amount Electrolux said it would save by moving.

Some Electrolux workers will return to school; others hope the improving economy brings jobs. Their message? Don't cry for Greenville.

This town of 8,000 thrived on timber well before refrigerators came along, they say, and it will thrive long after refrigerator production moves to South Carolina and Mexico.

Bold? Perhaps. Mike Huckleberry calls it a homegrown confidence that Swedish executives, NAFTA and milquetoast politician's cannot derail.

I'm confident, and my fellow businessmen are all confident Greenville will survive," said Huckleberry, who opened his downtown restaurant 12 years ago.

Once you work through feelings of betrayal, or "pure corporate greed," as some workers suggest, there's confidence. It is expressed in American flags, warm greetings and handshakes in a town founded 160 years ago when New Yorkers John and Deborah Green opened a sawmill on the Flat River.

If you have any doubts, stand under the Chemical Bank sign on the south side of M-57 west of downtown, and note the stream of taillights heading to jobs in Grand Rapids.

"We're getting people willing to drive to Grand Rapids because it's only 30 miles away and they still get the benefits of small-town living," Huckleberry said.

Greenville Mayor Lloyd Walker agrees. "Greenville is not going away," he said. "We're king of the trading center for a larger area of up to 100,000 people."

Although Electrolux rejected annual incentives of \$48 million—saying they were nearly \$33 million short—Walker is confident the same package can draw interest from other U.S. manufacturers.

"The incentive package will be in place," Walker said.

NUMBER CRUNCHING

Until a week ago, the Electrolux Task Force thought it had gathered nearly \$7 million in annual tax incentives and \$30 million in cost savings from a proposed new factory. Union leaders proposed another \$31.6 million

in concessions, or about \$13,000 for every worker.

The package from UAW Local 137 required membership approval, which was far from guaranteed.

Final tally: \$68.6 million, just \$12.4 million short. Or so they thought.

But Electrolux whacked \$20 million off the estimate for newplant savings, casting the total package into a \$32 million hole. Filling it would have cost more than \$27,000 a year per worker.

At \$15 an hour, most workers earn just over \$31,000, plus about \$12,000 in benefits.

"Overall, our analysis of the proposed new factory would save less money annually than was anticipated in the estimate," Electrolux spokesman Tony Evans said. "Also, it would cost for more to construct and operate than was anticipated."

Huckleberry, 55, a Greenville Chamber of Commerce board member, says he believes all the work that went into the incentive package still can bear fruit. Other manufacturers have already made queries about future uses for the plant covering three city blocks on the west side of North Irving Street.

There is still caution, certainly.

In addition to the 2,700 workers who lose their jobs, more than 800 others work for area companies that send refrigerator parts to Electrolux. Among the largest is Clarion Technologies, which makes vegetable crispers.

"It's not just suppliers, it's 2,700 people who aren't coming in to have coffee," retiree Donovan Harms said over a cup at Middlebrook's Bakery and Coffee Shop in downtown Greenville. "It's going to put a real bum on this town. We'll survive, but the town certainly won't be the same as it is now."

MOVING ON

Area churches are mobilizing to offer counseling for Electrolux employees, and are planning a community worship service.

"We are going to do whatever it takes to heal and move on," said the Rev. Jerry Jones, pastor at First Congregational Church of Greenville. Apathy, not Electrolux, is the biggest enemy, he said. The community must pull together "with a message of hope."

As if to convince himself things will be all right, Huckleberry embraced two customers—both Electrolux workers—as they left his restaurant mid-morning Friday. "We'll make it. You guys will be OK," he said.

Many of the workers, some 60 percent who live in Montcalm County, feel the same way.

"We all built this place; my dad started here in 1966," said 47-year-old John Baker, who today marks his 26th year with Electrolux.

He married in November and a year ago bought a home in Lakeview, about 25 miles away.

"It's going to be hard for a guy like me to find a job," Baker said. "I've thought about going back to school. Hopefully it'll work out."

"I've been getting ready for this day," said 43-year-old Gordy Heminger of Belding, who plans to go into house construction. "A lot of the guys in the plant, even the older ones, are going back to school. What else can they do?"

Huckleberry is quick to point out the plant will be making refrigerators through 2005, plenty of time for the city and its workforce to make necessary adjustments.

"We've got an airport, an industrial park and homes are being built all over," he said. "This isn't going to happen tomorrow. We've got two years to figure this out."

True enough, agrees 39-year-old Shirlene Taylor, who stopped in with a friend Friday for scrambled eggs and toast.

"The people you work with are like family, but the big corporations don't care about that," said Taylor, who recently lost her job at Attwood Corp. in Lowell, a former subsidiary of Steelcase. "We'll make it. Greenville is still a wonderful town."

[From the Grand Rapids Press, Jan. 17, 2004]

ONE BIG JOB LIES AHEAD FOR LAST TWO YEARS

(By Julia Bauer)

Electrolux workers will have plenty to do in the months until their plant closes.

Assembly of basic refrigerator models is moving out of Greenville to make way for a new Electrolux brand that will look like a built-in.

"Our South Carolina factory specializes in top-freezer refrigerators," Electrolux spokesman Tony Evans said. Both Greenville and the Anderson, S.C., plant can produce the models with the freezer on top, which can run up to 18 cubic feet.

"We've had that ability to build certain of those models in any location," he said.

Once that production moves out, Greenville employees who are all facing layoff next year will start preparing for the new line, at least for a few months. The plant is scheduled to close in 2005.

"We are about to go into manufacturing of a new product, a counter-deep refrigerator," Evans said. "The cabinet is roughly 24 inches deep, so it matches your typical countertop."

Greenville workers will cover the startup, but eventually the refrigerators will bear a "Made in Mexico" label.

Electrolux plans to spend \$150 million to open a plant in Mexico.

"Ultimately, those products will migrate to the new factory," Evans said. The company is providing no specifics on the location for the Mexico plant, although officials in the border town of Ciudad Juarez say they have hosted company representatives in recent weeks.

No new employees will be needed in South Carolina, Evans said. Most of the focus will be on the move to Mexico and production of the "mass luxury" model. Electrolux has not estimated how many employees the Mexico plant will need. The plants on the border with Texas employ Mexican factory workers who earn \$1.57 an hour plus benefits.

Electrolux cites the high labor costs at the union plant in Greenville, where wages are \$15 an hour, plus benefits. The plant has won awards for high productivity, and its division is making a profit.

But Electrolux is seeking higher revenues with lower labor expense. The last major upgrade at Greenville, a \$100 million retooling for Frigidaire's "Next Generation" line, was plagued with delays and cost overruns that added another \$40 million to the final tab. The startup required more employees and more overtime, and it resulted in missed deliveries.

At the last quarter conference in October, analysts told Electrolux chief executive Hans Straberg they were concerned with the company's ability to efficiently install another new line in Greenville, then move it to Mexico.

Electrolux, based in Stockholm, Sweden, is scheduled to report its financial results for 2003 on Feb. 12.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to talk about the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill that was signed into law by the President last year, which I consider a huge missed opportunity on behalf of the Congress because we really needed a meaningful prescription drug bill for seniors. That is not what we received. What we received really is nothing more than an attempt to privatize Medicare and not provide a meaningful prescription drug plan for seniors.

I wanted to particularly highlight tonight the fact that on the Republican side of the aisle there now are a series of events that have occurred with regard to members of the administration, Members of this House of Representatives, who have, in my opinion, taken advantage of the situation and of their position relative to either negotiating or passing this prescription drug measure that highlight again the fact that special interests and the pharmaceutical companies and the HMOs and the insurance companies were basically out to pass a prescription drug bill that would not provide meaningful coverage; that would not lower costs; and that essentially creates a hoax on the American people that we are somehow doing something about the issue of prescription drugs for seniors.

Meanwhile, the pharmaceutical companies and, yes, even our own Members of Congress and even a member of the administration continue to benefit personally from the fact that they were involved in these negotiations and now have taken jobs or opportunities in the private sector with those same prescription drug companies with whom they worked to negotiate what was essentially a bad bill.

Before I get into some of the specifics in that regard, I just wanted to highlight again why I think this prescription drug measure was a missed opportunity and does not really do anything to help America's seniors. The bill, H.R. 1, in my opinion, simply weakens the Medicare program and falls short of meeting the prescription drug needs of seniors.

H.R. 1, as we know, provides woefully inadequate prescription drug coverage due to a giant gap in coverage in which seniors receive no assistance with costs between \$2,250 and \$5,100 annually. About half of all seniors will not have drug coverage for part of the year, even though they will continue to pay monthly premiums.

I would like to explain what I mean by that. The problem with the Republican bill, unlike with what the Democrats had proposed, is that the Republican bill basically makes you pay so much out of pocket for what you are getting back in your benefit that it is not even worth having; and since it is a voluntary program, I would venture to guess that when this bill finally goes

into effect in a couple of years, most seniors would simply not opt for it because they have to pay out more than it is worth essentially. I have a little chart here that highlights what I mean.

For example, if a senior in the course of a year were to run up a bill of about \$1,000 for their prescription drug needs, under the Republican bill, they would have to pay \$857.50 for \$1,000 worth of coverage. If their annual drug costs were \$2,000, they would be paying about \$1,107 out of pocket. If their annual drug costs were \$3,000, they would be paying \$1,920 out of pocket; and if their annual drug costs were \$5,000, they would be paying \$3,920 out of pocket. You might say to yourself who in the world would want to take advantage of a bill that forces you to pay so much out of pocket to get a very meager amount back in coverage by the Federal Government? And that is really the point.

The second thing that is so important about this Republican prescription drug measure, if you want to call it that, is that it does nothing to reduce the costs of prescription drugs. When you talk to most seniors, they will say that the biggest problem they face is the price of the actual cost of the prescription drugs. What the bill does is it prohibits Medicare from using the bargaining power of 40 million seniors to negotiate lower prices. In other words, all of the sudden, if you have a Medicare prescription drug program, you have about 40 million seniors that the Medicare administration or the Secretary of Health and Human Services can go to the drug companies and say, look, I represent 40 million seniors, I am not going to buy prescription drugs from you, pharmaceutical company, unless you reduce the price; and since I represent all these people, I can buy a lot of drugs if you give me a good price.

This is how you negotiate. We do this with the VA. We do this with the Defense Department for our United States military. But under the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill, the Federal Government, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Medicare administrator was specifically forbidden from doing that kind of price negotiation to reduce prices. I mean, this is an outrage, but this is the reality.

The other thing is that the Republican bill pushes seniors into private plans through either an HMO or a PPO. In other words, if they want to get the prescription drugs, they are probably going have to join an HMO in order to get any kind of benefit whatsoever, which means that they lose their choice of doctors. There are so many problems with the bill I do not want to get into all of the problems tonight because I want to kind of highlight how this relates to some of the people that were negotiating the bill and some of the people here in Congress, as well as within the Bush administration, that

are benefiting from the fact that they were in charge of negotiating this very bad bill.

I wanted to also point out that the Democrats had an alternative to the Republican plan that would have actually accomplished the goal of providing a good benefit, reducing the cost of prescription drugs. And would have been immediately available as opposed to available in 2 years under the Republican proposal.

What the Democrats proposed to do was to simply follow the lead of what we do now with part B. Most seniors know that they pay a premium of about \$40, \$50 a month under part B of Medicare. That covers their doctors' bills, and they have a \$100 deductible. They have a 20 percent co-pay, but essentially it starts with the first prescription. There is no donut hole. There is no lack of coverage, and a certain amount at a catastrophic level, the government pays all the costs. Also, under the Democratic proposal we have specifically instructed the Medicare administrator and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate price reductions to reduce the costs of the prescription drugs. Very simple. You keep your doctor. You do not have to go through the HMO. Everybody's eligible for this prescription drug plan, and you pay a premium of about \$25 a month.

This is not what we got. This is not what the President signed into law. The bill that the President signed into law essentially, the Republican bill, says you are not going to get the coverage unless you go private, join an HMO or something like it. The coverage is very limited. You have to pay a tremendous amount out of pocket, the way I described; and there is actually a prohibition on the reduction or the negotiating of prices to try to bring the prices down.

You might say to yourself, why did this happen? Why is it that the Republican proposal and the one that was signed into law is so bad, and why did it not just follow what we had done traditionally with Medicare with part B, for example, with your doctor bills, the way the Democrats had proposed? The answer, in my opinion, is very simple, and that is because this bill was written by the pharmaceutical companies and by the insurance companies. The insurance companies wanted to make sure that you had to go private with an HMO or something like it in order to get the benefit, and the pharmaceutical companies wanted to make sure that there were no cost controls whatsoever in this benefit so that they would not lose money essentially from having to lower the cost of their prescription drugs.

This is what I would like to get into tonight, and I do not like to cast aspersions, but I do not think we have any choice. The irony of it is two of the key people or at least two of the key people that were involved in negotiating and working on this legislation have now

or are about to either join the pharmaceutical companies and leave, in one case, Congress; or in the other case, the Medicare administrator has already left the Bush administration to join a law firm that represents the drug companies; and I just want to talk about that a little bit tonight.

This is an article from today's Washington Post that says that the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce on the House side, which is my committee that I serve on, the committee that had jurisdiction over the Medicare legislation, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), I am reading from The Washington Post today, "is close to a decision to leave Congress to head the pharmaceutical industry's trade association after turning down an offer from Hollywood to succeed Jack Valenti as the movie industry's top lobbyist, sources in Washington and California said yesterday."

Tauzin telephoned Valenti and declined the offer from the Motion Picture Association, but The Washington Post goes on to say that he "is now considering an offer from the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, PhRMA, the trade group that represents trade giants such as Pfizer and Merck and Company."

He chairs the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. "He was one of the principal authors of the Medicare prescription drug bill that included several provisions expected to vastly expand the market for prescription drugs . . . in addition to adding hundreds of billions of dollars for drug benefits, the law bars the Federal Government from directly bargaining down the price of drugs, a provision PhRMA pressed for."

So the bottom line is PhRMA, representing the pharmaceutical companies, comes in here, negotiates with the committee to ban any kind of cost controls, any kind of negotiated prices. Now that the Republican chairman of the committee, a nice gentleman but nonetheless the Republican chairman of the committee, is likely, according to this, to take a job at PhRMA, the pharmaceutical trade company's top representative, the head of it.

At some point, you have to say to yourself, Mr. Speaker, where does it end? Where does the special interests, in this case of the drug companies, I could probably use the same example with the HMOs and the insurance companies, where does their ability to influence legislation in what I consider a bad way because it in this case means there was no effort to negotiate prices and lower prices for seniors, where does their ability to influence what goes on here and when we have this revolving door, where they come in here and get the committee and the Congress to ban any kind of negotiated prices, and then the person who is the chairman of the committee decides maybe that he will go on to represent this trade group?

I want to use another example because I mentioned the Medicare administrator. The person who was the Medicare administrator within the Department of Health and Human Services at the time when this prescription drug bill was being debated and negotiated here in Congress, again under the Bush administration, a Republican by the name of Tom Scully, last month took a job with a law firm in an investment company that represents these pharmaceutical companies. So here we have again the top person in the Bush administration who is negotiating this bill, a bad bill, one that is not helping the senior citizens, after the bill is passed, leaves the Bush administration, the Medicare administrator position, and goes to work for a law firm that essentially represents these same pharmaceutical companies.

□ 2015

Now, it was interesting because there was an article, again in *The Washington Post*, about a week ago, January 14, that says, "Now the White House has ordered Federal agencies to stop issuing ethics waivers that allow key officials to negotiate jobs while they are shaping policies important to potential private employers." So this was a memo that was issued by the White House Chief of Staff about a week ago saying that "Effective immediately only the White House can approve such waivers."

The problem here is that Federal law bars Presidential appointees, such as Tom Scully, who is the Medicare Administrator, from discussing possible employment with firms involved in or hoping to be involved in matters handled by those officials. So Scully was negotiating the Medicare prescription drug bill in a way that helped the pharmaceutical companies and did a disservice to the senior citizens of this country by not allowing any kind of negotiated price reductions.

There actually is Federal law that says that he cannot, while he holds that Medicare Administrator position, he cannot look for another job with a company or a law firm that is involved in those negotiations. But he can get a waiver, which was granted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, a waiver to seek that job and talk to those companies to get a job at the same time that he is negotiating this Medicare prescription bill.

The waiver was granted. And now they are saying, well, maybe it should not have been granted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In the future, we will only let the White House, I guess the President himself, grant those kind of waivers.

Well, these waivers should not be allowed at all. It is outrageous, in my opinion, that the Medicare Administrator, who is negotiating and trying to come up with a prescription drug bill, is allowed to go out and seek a job at the same time with those same law firms or companies that he is now ne-

gotiating to put in a provision that would ban the ability to negotiate price reductions.

He had a waiver so that he was allowed to do it. That was given by the same administration, the Bush administration, ultimately the White House as well, so that he could go about trying to look for a job with those same law firms or companies that were trying to get him to bargain for some provisions in the bill that were to their liking.

I mean, where are we going with this whole issue of special interests and the ability of special interests to influence not only the White House and the Medicare Administrator who is working under the President, but also the Republican chairman of the committee that also has jurisdiction over this Medicare prescription drug bill? I do not know where it ends.

I just want to give one more example, which I know has already been mentioned by others, but many of us remember the night here on the floor of the House of Representatives when we were voting on this Medicare prescription drug bill; and when the vote first took place and the 15 or 17 minutes were up, when we are supposed to vote and put our cards in the machines and post our names and how we voted up on the wall here, the bill had actually lost. There was a majority against the bill. An absolute majority was against the bill, so that the bill should have been defeated.

But what the Republican leadership in the House here did, the Speaker, the majority leader, they spent the next 3 or 4 hours, I do not know how long it was, but it was at least 3 hours, twisting arms and trying to use whatever means they could to convince Republican Members to change their votes. And they actually were able to get enough to change their votes so that they switched the majority from defeating the bill to passing the bill several hours after the machines were supposed to close.

I mean, there are all kinds of examples of the kinds of arm-twisting that was taking place and the kind of special interests that were being used. The Secretary of Health and Human Services was here on the floor twisting arms. I saw him personally. But I want to give the most egregious example, which has been mentioned before. In fact, in an effort to show how much the Republican leadership is willing to go to do the bidding of the special interests, in this case the pharmaceutical industry and the insurers, this is an editorial from *The Washington Post* on December 30, during our congressional recess. And I am not going to read the whole thing, but I want to read part of it, because I think it is part of this whole thing, and what I need to do to expose what is going on around here.

It says, "Mr. Smith Leaves Washington," talking about the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), a Republican. It says, "Something ugly hap-

pened to Representative NICK SMITH on the long night of the House Medicare vote last month that seems beyond dispute. With his party lacking the votes to muscle the prescription drug bill through, Mr. SMITH was subjected to intense and quite possibly criminal pressure to induce him to abandon his opposition to the Medicare bill. As Mr. SMITH related it the next day, Members and groups offered financial and political support for his son Brad, who is running for his father's seat, if only he would vote for the bill. The first offer was to give him \$100,000-plus for his campaign and endorsements by national GOP leadership, Mr. SMITH elaborated a few days later. When he refused, he said he was threatened that, "Well, if you do not change your vote, then some of us are going to work to make sure your son does not get into Congress."

Again, it goes on to talk about how the House Speaker was among those importuning the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) in the final hours of the Medicare vote. And, of course, *The Washington Post* goes on to say that "The Justice Department should fully investigate the matter. If Justice declines to proceed, the ethics committee must step up to the plate."

To my knowledge, neither of those things has happened. But, again, I just want to highlight this because that prescription drug bill was so important to seniors and it was such a missed opportunity to do something that would have actually been helpful to seniors as opposed to doing something that only helps the insurance companies or the pharmaceutical companies. And you just get a little flavor of what goes on here and what contributed to the fact that this bad bill passed: arm-twisting to get Members to change their votes with threats of giving money or withholding donations from candidates, and members of the administration in charge of the Medicare program being offered jobs to work for the very companies that were pharmaceutical companies and their representatives that were benefiting from the legislation; and now the possibility, and we will find out, I guess, in a few days, of the Republican chairman of the committee that had jurisdiction actually going to become the chief representative of PhRMA, the trade group for these very same pharmaceutical interests. It is a very sad day, and the consequences to America's seniors are very bad.

Just in case anybody has any doubt about why this bill is not good and what it means to the industry and what goes on around here, I just wanted to make reference to an editorial that was in *The New York Times* this Sunday. It says, "Patches For the Drug Program." And I am not going to read it all, Mr. Speaker, but I want to read some relevant parts because I think it sums up the problem that we face.

The *New York Times* says in the Sunday editorial, "In the weeks since the Medicare prescription drug bill was

signed into law, the changes that need to be made in this vital legislation have become increasingly apparent. It is not likely that Congress will act in a political year, but Democrats who criticize the bill should lay markers down now on what has to change, and those amendments should be brought up as soon as possible, either before or after the election."

They go on to say in *The New York Times* that "Anyone who followed the rancorous congressional debate knows that the new program has a huge coverage gap, known as the doughnut hole, that exposes many beneficiaries to \$3,600 in out-of-pocket costs before catastrophic coverage kicks in. That makes no sense from an insurance perspective, but was intended to keep the program's costs from getting out of control. Less well-known," and I have not even mentioned this, Mr. Speaker, "is the likelihood that the drug coverage will actually become worse with each passing year. The premiums, deductibles and out-of-pocket expenditures will all increase rapidly, tied to increases in per capita drug expenditures under Medicare. By 2013," about another 10 years, "for example, the out-of-pocket spending required before a person qualifies for catastrophic coverage will probably be \$6,400 a year, well above the \$3,600 required in the first year. That could be devastating for those struggling to survive on Social Security benefits."

It is so sad. I mean, what *The New York Times* is saying is what I talked about earlier in terms of out-of-pocket expenditures; that they are only going to get worse as time goes on. I do not think most people will even sign up for this when it goes into effect in 2 years because their out-of-pocket costs are so bad compared to what they would actually benefit. But what *The New York Times* is saying is that that differential is going to get even worse as time goes on.

The New York Times editorial from Sunday goes on to talk about the drug pricing that I mentioned before. They say, "Drug prices must also be controlled. Unfortunately, the most glaring fault in the bill is its failure to employ the strongest weapon for reining in drug costs. As the political price for passing the bill, congressional Republicans inserted language prohibiting the Medicare program from using its substantial market power to negotiate low prices from the drug companies. Instead, the program will rely on private insurance plans or pharmacy benefit managers to negotiate. That was a mistake. The ban on government intervention reflects the Republicans' aversion to government price controls, but it is also testimony to the lobbying clout of the drug industry, a major patron of the Republican Party. Democratic leaders have introduced bills to allow Medicare to negotiate directly, but that will be a tough sell in a Republican Congress that opposes any changes before the law has had a

chance to work. The AARP has now suggested that Congress should allow the government to negotiate drug prices if private efforts fail to produce big discounts."

Well, I do not have to go on. *The New York Times* is just confirming what I have said all along. This was nothing but a bone thrown to the pharmaceutical industry that did not want any kind of effort to negotiate lower prices; and now we see that the representatives, be they Members of the House, Republican Members, or members of the administration who were directly involved in these negotiations to make sure that there was this ban on any effort to lower prices, are now joining those same drug companies or the law firms that represent them.

The special interests just reign supreme here in the Republican-controlled Congress and in the White House. And worst of all, and this is the last thing I will mention on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I could not believe that on Saturday there was an article in *The New York Times* about how the Department of Health and Human Services is now stepping up efforts against drug imports. Those of us who were here back in November when we had this debate know full well that there was an effort that was successful on the part of mostly Democrats but also some Republicans to put into the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill a provision that would have allowed reimportation of drugs from Canada, if not from other countries, where the FDA has certified the production and the factory where the drugs are being produced. We actually were successful in getting language in the bill, believe it or not. I do not know how we did it, but we managed on a bipartisan basis to get language in the bill that would allow and legalize reimportation from Canada as a way of trying to reduce the prices of drugs.

We know that in Canada, unlike in the United States, they negotiate price reductions on behalf of not only seniors but all their citizens, so the prices for the prescription drugs are significantly lower. But what this Bush administration does is, after the law passes, they say that they will refuse to certify that drugs being reimported from Canada are safe and, therefore, because they will not certify that those drugs are safe, they now say that it is still illegal to reimport the drugs from Canada. What the Bush administration is now doing, what the FDA is now doing, is basically trying to prevent the reimportation of the drugs.

This is what was in *The New York Times* on Saturday, January 24. And, again, I just want to read some sections from it because it is unbelievable to me how far they will go to protect the pharmaceutical industry at the expense of the average senior in the United States who is trying to find some way, albeit even having to reimport the drugs from Canada, to try to reduce their drug prices, because

they simply cannot afford to pay these steep prices for these prescription drugs.

This article says that "A second 'blitz' inspection by Federal drug and Customs officials of medicines imported from Canada has found that nearly all of almost 2,000 packages opened contained foreign versions of American pharmaceuticals that officials said might not be safe." And I use that, "might not be safe." They are not saying they are not safe, they are saying they might not be safe. Well, what is the basis for their saying they might not be safe? Nothing. There is absolutely nothing in the article and nothing that they did to show that in fact these reimported drugs were not safe.

In fact, in *The New York Times* article, it says, "Asked if the pills reviewed in the latest survey that they were inspecting were unsafe, Dr. McClellan," who is the FDA Commissioner and a Bush appointee, answered, "We just don't know because it's so hard to tell." Well, what kind of answer is that, Mr. Speaker?

□ 2030

Americans are trying to get drugs reimported from Canada, and there is every reason to believe they are safe, there is no reason to believe they are not; and they are seizing all these drugs. And when the commissioner is asked if they are safe, he said we do not know because it is so hard to tell. There is nothing in this article that indicates that they have found anything that indicates that these drugs are not safe. I think they are harassing those who are trying to do the reimportation.

Mr. Speaker, Governors and mayors around the country, because they are so concerned about the cost of prescription drugs for their own citizens, for their seniors, are trying to come up with ways of providing a government program, either in the case of the mayors for their cities or Governors for their States, to reimport these drugs from Canada at a low cost. I do not have to give all of the examples here, but I think one of the States that has taken a lead on this is Illinois, which has talked about a major program to try to accomplish this goal.

But what the Bush administration says, and this is again from *The New York Times*, the Bush administration is hoping to use a combination of aggressive inspections and pointed political advice to persuade local and State officials to back away from the border drug trade. This is Dr. McClellan that is being paraphrased. And the State officials who are trying to set up these programs are turning their heads because they do not know what to do. They think it is ridiculous what the FDA is trying to do. This is not even a partisan issue. Some of the Governors trying to set up the programs and that are objecting to what the Bush administration is doing on the Canadian reimportation issue are Republicans.

There is one quote here from Governor Tom Pawlenty, a Republican from Minnesota; and he says that the FDA will sue somebody or throw somebody in jail over this, the pharmaceutical companies choke off supply, or the FDA comes to their senses. He is very concerned about what the administration is trying to do to stop the supply of drugs going into Minnesota, which he believes are safe.

It goes on and on and talks about all of the things that the FDA is trying to do to cut the supply; that the drug companies are sending fewer drugs to Canada and are trying to choke off the supply. Everything is being done to try to help the pharmaceutical companies not have to provide lower-cost drugs. The actions of my fellow Congressman and the Bush administration officials in this regard are just outrageous. I think it is imperative to keep speaking out against what is going on, against those Republican officials within the administration and in our case the chairman of our committee who are now taking jobs with these companies after they negotiated this legislation, this bad bill. Somehow the public has to be made aware, Mr. Speaker, of all these activities. I know that I am going to be back again on another night talking about this and have some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle join with me.

Before I close, I just wanted to move to another topic which is totally unrelated to this, but it is timely. I would like to take 5 minutes to switch to this topic that relates to foreign policy, not only to U.S. foreign policy, but also to activities at the U.N.

Tomorrow, President Bush is meeting with the Prime Minister of Turkey, and I know there are a number of things that they are going to discuss; but I would like to discuss this evening what I would like our President to do, which is to basically have President Bush exert pressure on the Turkish Government to convince the Turkish Cypriot leader, Rauf Denktash, to return to the negotiating table on Cyprus and truly work for a peace settlement over the Cyprus issue.

I was in Cyprus this summer. Some may know that Cyprus is about to join the European Union as of May 1 of this year; but Cyprus is still a divided island. The Turkish Government invaded Cyprus in 1974. They occupy about a third of the northern part of the island; and every effort that has been made over the last few years, and it really came to the point where we thought there was really a possibility last spring that there would be an agreement between the Turkish Cypriot government and the Government of the Republic of Cyprus to unify the island and have the Turkish troops leave before Cyprus joined the European Union. So far that has not happened, but I still think there is an opportunity for that to happen.

I would like to see if President Bush can put some pressure on the Turkish

Prime Minister tomorrow to have him essentially exert some influence over the Turkish Cypriot government in the northern occupied part of Cyprus to come to agreement and unify the island under one government before Cyprus' accession to the European Union.

This weekend, before his trip to the United States, the Turkish Prime Minister said he would allow the United Nations to "fill in the blanks" of a settlement to the Cyprus issue. The Prime Minister also urged U.N. Secretary Kofi Annan to appoint a new Cyprus negotiator and said he would urge the Turkish Cypriot leader to go along with settlement proposals. While these words are encouraging from the Prime Minister, one has to remember they were made right before his trip to the United States. In the past, Turkish leaders have made statements showing the importance of a peace settlement; but, unfortunately, these words have not translated into action.

In fact, just days before Prime Minister Erdogan made this pledge, Denktash continued his intransigence, stating that the whole world is trying to take Cyprus away from the Turks. Denktash even joked in reference to the Turkish Government when he said, "Come, give Cyprus away to the Greek Cypriots and get over with it."

Mr. Speaker, Denktash is not just going to listen to Turkish leaders. But Denktash's comments show an uneasiness with the perception that Turkey is finally willing to agree to a settlement with the framework created by the U.N. Now would be the perfect time for Turkey to exert pressure on Denktash and his government, and this is something that President Bush should strongly urge during his meeting tomorrow.

At a time when Turkey is interested in joining the European Union, its lack of cooperation in the efforts to solve the Cyprus problem can only result in a setback for Turkey's candidacy. On May 1, Cyprus will join the European Union. Last week, the European Enlargement Commissioner, Genter Verheugen, warned that the status quo would damage everyone, whereas a solution would be a clear win/win situation for Greece, Cyprus, Turkey, and Europe as a whole. In an article in the Financial Times, it was pointed out by the European Enlargement Commissioner that "the absence of a solution when we reach May 1 would deepen the island's division." He stressed that a settlement of the Cyprus problem does not constitute an additional criterion for Turkey's bid to join the European Union, but also questioned whether it would be likely that all 25 member states, including the Republic of Cyprus, will decide unanimously at the end of this year to start accession negotiations with Turkey as long as the island remains divided.

Again, I would stress being particularly for Turkey, which wants to join and hopes by the end of this year that there will be some movement towards

its own accession to the European Union. There is really very little time for Turkey to play a role to settle the Cyprus issue. I would hope with a little pressure from President Bush tomorrow, the Turkish Prime Minister will return to Ankara and stress to Denktash like never before the importance that the Turkish Cypriot leadership put aside unreasonable and unacceptable demands and finally negotiate in good faith with the leadership of the Republic of Cyprus.

Ultimately, the victims of these shortsighted policies from Ankara and the Turkish Cypriot leadership are the people of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community, who will continue to be deprived of an opportunity to share in the economic, social, and other benefits of European Union membership.

Again I would say that the statements made by the Turkish Prime Minister over the weekend and the Turkish military seem to indicate that they want the Turkish Cypriot government to move ahead with the settlement that could be accomplished possibly by May 1. But we have heard this before. I think the best course is if our President Bush can really make it clear to the Turkish Prime Minister tomorrow how important this is and how timely it is that some action be taken to achieve a unified Cyprus by May 1. I know that President Bush is interested in accomplishing this, and I hope that he does put sufficient pressure on the Prime Minister of Turkey so we can see some progress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. FROST (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family matters.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather-related travel problems.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather-related travel problems.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of weather-related travel problems.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal family matters.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of his flight being canceled due to inclement weather on the east coast.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, January 28.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and January 28.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, January 28.

Mr. SHUSTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, January 28.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 28, 2004, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6366. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's

final rule—Export Sales Reporting Requirements—received January 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6367. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fire and Rescue and Other Community Facilities Projects (RIN: 0575-AC53) received December 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6368. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Artificially Dwarfed Plants in Growing Media from the People's Republic of China [Docket No. 98-103-5] received January 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6369. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Eucalyptus Logs, Lumber, and Wood Chips From South America [Docket No. 02-097-2] received January 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6370. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rules, Policies, and Procedures for Corporate Activities; Bank Activities and Operations; Real Estate Lending and Appraisals [Docket No. 03-24] (RIN: 1557-AB97) received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6371. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Electronic Filings [Docket No. 04-01] (RIN: 1557-AC13) received January 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6372. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Commission Guidance Regarding Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations [Release Nos. 33-8350; 34-48960; FR-72] received December 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6373. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Processing Requirements for Cancelled Security Certificates [Release No. 34-48931; File No. S7-18-00] (RIN: 3235-AH94) received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6374. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Services Division, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged (RIN: 1810-AA95) received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6375. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Head Start Program (RIN: 0970-AC16) received January 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6376. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Dept., Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying

Benefits—received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6377. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Dept., Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Disclosure to Participants; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-employer Plans—received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6378. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Dept., Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age—received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6379. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants) (RIN: 1991-AB56) received December 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6380. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Acesulfame Potassium [Docket No. 2002F-0220] received January 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6381. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Scientific Peer Review of Research Grant Applications and Research and Development Contract Projects (RIN: 0925-AA) received December 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6382. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: NAC-UMS Revision (RIN: 3150-AH25) received January 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6383. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—December 2002 Wassenaar Arrangement Plenary Agreement Implementation: Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Commerce Control List, and Reporting Requirements [Docket No. 031017263-3263-01] (RIN: 0694-AC85) received December 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6384. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Chemical Weapons Convention Regulations: Electronic Submission of Declarations and Reports through the Web-Data Entry System for Industry (Web-DESI) [Docket No. 031211331-3311-01] (RIN: 0694-AC97) received January 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6385. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Circular 2001-18; Introduction—received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6386. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly

Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Season and Size Limit Adjustments [Docket No. 031028268-3321-02; I.D. 091603F] (RIN: 0648-AR12) received January 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6387. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Debt Collection Improvement Act — Treasury Offset and Cross Servicing (RIN: 0570-AA52) received January 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6388. A letter from the Under Secretary and Director, USPTO, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Implement the 2002 Inter Partes Reexamination and other Technical Amendments to the Patent Statute [Docket No.: 2003-P-001] (RIN: 0651-AB57) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6389. A letter from the Director, Torts Branch, Civil Division, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certification and Decertification in Connection With Certain Suits Based Upon Acts or Omissions of Federal Employees and Other Persons [CIV 102F; AG Order No. 2697-2003] (RIN: 1105-AA62) received January 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6390. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Use of Locomotive Horns at Highway-Rail Grade Crossings [Docket No. FRA-1999-6439, Notice No. 8] (RIN: 2130-AA71) received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6391. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30399; Amdt. No. 3085] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6392. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30398; Amdt. No. 3084] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6393. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Waverly, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16502; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-86] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6394. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Oskaloosa, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16500; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-84] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6395. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Osceola, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16499; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-83] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6396. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Tipton, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16501; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-85] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6397. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Mount Pleasant, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16498; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-82] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6398. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E4 Airspace; and Modification of Class E5 Airspace; Goodland, KS [Docket No. 2003-16079; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-71] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6399. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Buckhannon, WV [Docket No. FAA-2003-15229; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-05] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6400. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 172R, 172S, 182S, 182T, T182T, 206H, and T206H Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-28-AD; Amendment 39-13382; AD 2003-24-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6401. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F, DC-10-30F (KC10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-207-AD; Amendment 39-13379; AD 2003-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6402. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-68-AD; Amendment 39-13380; AD 2003-24-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6403. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87), and MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-150-AD; Amendment 39-13383; AD 2003-24-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6404. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-70-AD; Amendment 39-13378; AD 2003-24-09] (RIN: 1220-AA64) received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6405. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Sidney, NE [Docket No. FAA-2003-16409; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-78] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6406. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Plattsburgh, NE [Docket No. FAA-2003-16408; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-76] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6407. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D Airspace; and Modification of Class E Airspace; Topeka, Philip Billard Municipal Airport, KS [Docket No. FAA-2003-16407; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-75] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6408. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Johnson, KS [Docket No. FAA-2003-16411; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-77] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6409. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Hilton Head Island, SC [Docket No. FAA-2003-16359; Airspace Docket No. 03-ASO-18] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6410. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Erie, PA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16119; Airspace Docket No. 03-AEA-13] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6411. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Jamestown, NY [Docket No. FAA-2003-16120; Airspace Docket No. 03-AEA-12] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6412. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Honesdale, PA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16220; Airspace Docket No. 03-AEA-15] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6413. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Canby, MN [Docket No. FAA-2003-15877; Airspace Docket No. 03-AGL-15] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6414. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Wilmington Clinton Field, OH [Docket No. FAA-

2003-15834; Airspace Docket No. 03-AGL-13] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6415. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Chicago, IL [Docket No. FAA-2003-15465; Airspace Docket No. 03-AGL-11] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6416. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30400; Amdt. No. 3086] received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6417. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service Difficulty Reports [Docket No. FAA-2000-7952] (RIN: 2120-A113) received January 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6418. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reasonable Charges for Medical Care or Services; 2003 Methodology Changes (RIN: 2900-AL06) received December 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6419. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing New Treasury Direct System — received January 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6420. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Request for Comments Concerning the Application of Section 162 and 263 to Tangible Property [Notice 2004-6] received January 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6421. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 165 Worthless Stock Deduction of a Subsidiary (Rev. Rul. 2003-125) received December 12, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6422. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch (Legal Processing Division), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Arbitrage restrictions applicable to tax-exempt bonds issued by state and local governments [TD 9097] (RIN: 1545-AX22) received December 12, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6423. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Filing of Applications and Related Forms (Regulations No. 4 and 22) (RIN: 0960-AF52) received January 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6424. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Programs; Rural Health Clinics: Amendments to Participation Requirements and Payment Provisions; and Establishment of a Quality Assessment and Performance Improvement Program

[CMS-1910-F] (RIN: 0938-AJ17) received December 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6425. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System Payment Reform for Calendar Year 2004 [CMS-1371-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AM96) received December 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6426. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Prescription Drug Discount Card (RIN: 0938-AM71) received December 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 502. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 610) to amend the provisions of title 5, United States Code, to provide for workforce flexibilities and certain Federal personnel provisions relating to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-406). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 503. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1920) to extend for 6 months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted (Rept. 108-407). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 3729. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide a monthly monetary benefit to certain individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 3730. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for immediate implementation of full concurrent receipt for retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability of both military retired pay paid by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs paid by reason of their disability; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consider-

ation of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 3731. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse members of the Armed Forces who participated in the Department of Defense Rest and Recuperation Leave program for travel expenses incurred by or on behalf of such members before the program was expanded to include domestic travel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 3732. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal the recently enacted two-year delay in the implementation of the country of origin labeling requirements of such Act for certain agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 3733. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 410 Huston Street in Altamont, Kansas, as the "Myron V. George Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for

herself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. HART, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NUNES, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. NEY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BURR, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. KLINE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BUYER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 3734. A bill to designate the Federal building located at Fifth and Richardson Avenues in Roswell, New Mexico, as the "Joe Skeen Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H. Con. Res. 350. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Transparency Day, which promotes the financial transparency of charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. RANGEL introduced a bill (H.R. 3735) for the relief of Kadiatou Diallo, Laouratou Diallo, Ibrahima Diallo, Abdoul Diallo, Mamadou Bobo Diallo, Mamadou Pathe Diallo, Fatoumata Traore Diallo, Sankarela Diallo, and Marliatou Bah; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 63: Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 120: Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 198: Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 282: Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 380: Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 584: Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 716: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 738: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 742: Mr. SCHROCK and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 785: Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 847: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 857: Mr. NEY.
 H.R. 931: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 1083: Mr. OLVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 1157: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1160: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1321: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 1385: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 1430: Ms. LEE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 1434: Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 1634: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 1653: Mr. SCHROCK and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 1730: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 1731: Ms. WATSON and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 1919: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1924: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 1930: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1998: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JOHN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. WEINER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. STENHOLM.
 H.R. 2023: Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. BASS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 2194: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 2233: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 2239: Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 2246: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 2247: Mr. FARR and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 2256: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2260: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2394: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 2404: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2527: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 2568: Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 2585: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2625: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 2711: Mr. CARDIN.
 H.R. 2719: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 2787: Mrs. KELLY.
 H.R. 2808: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 2821: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2823: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota and Mr. PORTER.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 2844: Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 2906: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 2934: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 2945: Mr. OWENS and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 3103: Mr. GORDON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-

BALART of Florida, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. TERRY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3104: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 3120: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3180: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 3191: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 3192: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 3242: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3243: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3271: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 3275: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 3299: Mr. HALL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3307: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 3311: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 3324: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 3337: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 3355: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3360: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 3361: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 3403: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 3424: Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3425: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3440: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3450: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H.R. 3453: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 3458: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 3473: Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 3474: Mr. GORDON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REYES, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 3480: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 3482: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 3484: Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 3513: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 3574: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 3611: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 3615: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 3618: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 3658: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. STARK, Mr. JOHN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FORD, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. KIND, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HALL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BURR, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RAMSTAD,

Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WU, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 3678: Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3688: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 3690: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. QUINN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 3695: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 3696: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H.R. 3707: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3708: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. NORTUP, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H. Con. Res. 78: Ms. SOLIS.
 H. Con. Res. 111: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H. Con. Res. 165: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. RADANOVICH.
 H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Con. Res. 218: Ms. GINNEY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. STUPAK.
 H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. KING of New York.
 H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. WEXLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. OWENS.
 H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
 H. Con. Res. 311: Mr. FROST.
 H. Con. Res. 335: Mr. POMEROY.
 H. Res. 60: Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H. Res. 103: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H. Res. 133: Mr. COLE.
 H. Res. 268: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CASE.
 H. Res. 302: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H. Res. 387: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H. Res. 402: Mr. SIMMONS.
 H. Res. 410: Mr. WEXLER.
 H. Res. 446: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. PITTS.
 H. Res. 466: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PORTER.
 H. Res. 477: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 485: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H. Res. 499: Mr. SABO, Mr. STARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BELL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ALLEN, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H. Res. 500: Mr. CASE, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2682: Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.